

Stenographic Transcript Of
HEARINGS
Before The
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE

Volume No. 1

S. 939

Washington, D. C.

JANUARY 29, 1970

Alderson Reporting Company, Inc.

Official Reporters

300 Seventh St., S. W. Washington, D. C.

NA 8-2345

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	United States Senate,	Washington, D. C.
2	Subcommittee on Education of the	January 29, 1970
3	Committee on Labor and Public	
	Welfare,	
4	STATEMENT OF:	P A G E
5	Howard Mace, Deputy Director General , For-	
6	eigh Service (accompanied by: Joseph Toner,	14
	and Dr. George Hilderbran	
7	Dr. George Grassmuck, Special Assistant to	
8	the Secretary for International Affairs, HEW	48
9	Francis Wilcox, Dean, Johns Hopkins School	
	of Advanced International Studies	64
10	Professor Raymond Tanter, Department of	
11	Political Science, University of Michigan,	
	Ann Arbor, Michigan	78
12	Mrs. Mary Condon Gereau, Legislative Con-	
13	sultant, NEA, on behalf of Dr. John M.	
	Lumley, NEA	91
14	Dr. Samson B. Knoll, Dean of Faculty, The	
15	Monterey Institution of Foreign Studies,	
	Monterey, California	100
16	Parker Hart, President, Middle East Insti-	
17	tute, Wash, D. C. (Former Director, Foreign	
	Service Institute)	118
18	Hon. George Allen, President, Diplomatic	
19	and Consular Officers, Inc., Wash, D. C.,	
		134
20	Ghosh J. Zogby, Vice President, Foreign	
21	Service Research, Inc., Wash, D. C.	149
22	Dr. Vincent Davis, Princeton Center for	
	International Studies, Princeton, N. J.	156
23		
24		
25		

1 S. 939
2 - - -

3 THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1970
4 - - -

5 United States Senate,

6 Subcommittee on Education of the
7 Committee on Labor and Public
8 Welfare,

9 Washington, D. C.

10 The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room
11 4232, New Senate Office Building, Senator Claiborne Pell
12 (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

13 Present: Senators Pell, Javits and Dominick.

14 Senator Pell. The Subcommittee on Education will come to
15 order.

16 Today, we will hear witnesses discussing their views on
17 S. 939, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, in ord
18 order to provide for United States Foreign Service Corps,
19 introduced by Senator Peter Dominick of Colorado.

20 Do to our extensive witness list I will not go into the
21 detail of the bill at this time but look forward to hearing
22 witnesses, not only as the Chairman of the Subcommittee, but
23 also as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and I have
24 a completely open mind with regard to it.

25 Senator Dominick. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could read a
brief statement?

Senator Pell. Certainly.

1 Senator Dominick. Mr. Chairman, as we begin hearings this
2 morning on my bill, S. 939, which is a scholarship program,
3 called the Foreign Service Corps, it seems proper that I make a
4 few opening remarks.

5 First of all, I would like to say I am delighted to have
6 the bill come before the Education Subcommittee at a time when
7 it is chaired by Senator Pell. With your background as a State
8 Department and Foreign Service Officer for seven years, your
9 very able assistance during consideration of the merits of the
10 proposal will be of benefit to us all.

11 I don't think it is necessary for me to go into detail con-
12 cerning the provisions of the bill. I will ask, however, that
13 the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be
14 printed in the hearing record.

15 Senator Pell. Without objection.

16 (The document to be furnished follows:)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Senator Dominick. The bill provides as you know, a
2 sizeable scholarship program. Full educational aid -- tuition,
3 fees, room and board -- would be available for students
4 interested in working for the Government in a civilian capacity.
5 The positions for which they would be educated would be those
6 which either require actual residence in a foreign country, or
7 those where the point of residence would remain within the
8 United States but the position requires regular contact with
9 citizens of other countries. Some scholarships would be for
10 undergraduate schooling; others for graduate schooling.

11 Many Government agencies already have job slots which fit
12 this description. Just as important as the new input we would
13 receive in these agencies from the graduating students, are
14 those people already employed by the Federal Government in
15 these positions. They, too, would be eligible for scholarships
16 to further their education on a continuing basis.

17 What is the extent of need for better education in this
18 area?

19 First, let me emphasize this is not a program to train or
20 to replace Foreign Service Officers. As of November 30, 1969,
21 there were only 3,278 active members in that select group known
22 as Foreign Service Officers.

23 In retrospect, the choice of the term "Foreign Service" to
24 be placed with the term "Corps" has proven unfortunate and
25 misleading. While Foreign Service Officers would be eligible

1 for scholarships, they comprise only a tiny fraction of the
2 civilian employees the bill is designed to assist.

3 Aside from employees resident within the United States
4 who would be eligible, almost every Federal department and
5 agency has U.S. citizens employed in foreign countries. Reliable
6 data on how many there are, in what country they are located,
7 and particularly what they are doing and their educational
8 background is difficult to obtain.

9 Nevertheless, rarely have I been as disappointed with a
10 report filed with a Senate committee as I am with the one filed
11 by the General Accounting Office, dated April 1, 1969, commenting
12 on my bill. With all due respect to GAO, the report glosses
13 over the problem and is rather typical of the lack of interest
14 and lack of awareness with these issues that I have found in
15 the various Government departments and agencies.

16 Let me give you an example. The GAO report on S. 939
17 states:

18 In April, 1968, it was announced that there were 22,757
19 United States citizens employed overseas, and that this would
20 be reduced by 2,779 with similar reductions in foreign, national
21 and contract employment. Special efforts are being made to
22 provide jobs for these people in the continental United States
23 and, as a result, there may be some question as to the need for
24 substantial recruitment at this time.

25 Contrast the GAO information, if you will, with that I

1 obtained from the Manpower Statistics Division of the Civil
2 Service Commission. As of June 30, 1968 -- just 60 days after
3 GAO asserts there were 22,757 U.S. citizens employed overseas
4 and the number was declining -- citizens on the payroll as
5 civilians overseas totaled 58,841. Of that amount, 38,029 were
6 in foreign countries and 20,812 were in U.S. territories, over
7 twice what the GAO said there were.

8 The latest information available from the Civil Service
9 Commission is for the month of December, 1969. It shows a
10 total of 63,594 United States citizens on the Federal payroll
11 overseas. Of that amount, 42,332 are in foreign countries and
12 21,262 in U.S. territories.

13 I mentioned that many Government agencies have employees
14 involved in areas which will be assisted by the scholarships.
15 At the conclusion of my remarks, I will offer several tables
16 for the hearing record with details. I will mention only a few
17 of them at this point.

18 Setting aside for the moment the obvious examples of the
19 State Department, USIA and civilian employees of the Defense
20 Department, and limiting the numbers strictly to those residing
21 in foreign countries, the number of Federal civilian employees
22 serving overseas as of last December in some of the agencies
23 is as follows:

24
25

		<u>Foreign Countries</u>	
<u>Agency</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>U.S. Citizens</u>	<u>Non-Citizens</u>
Agriculture	685	333	352
Interior	419	403	16
Transportation	328	298	30
Commerce	286	160	126
Justice	199	173	26
Hew	182	180	2

There are only six different agencies who have over 2500 people serving overseas of which at least over half consist of U.S. citizens.

Let me stress that these figures only include those actually residing overseas. Hopefully, we will get something of the people who live over here but are in contact overseas all the time.

As Senator Pell so ably stated during the 1963 hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on alternative bills to establish a Government-owned academy, those have been put in by both Democrats and Republicans, including myself:

We need to do more in this field -- of that there is general agreement. The question is how to do it.

The bill before us today is not a foreign service academy bill. They were first introduced in Congress in 1943 but no progress has been made in 27 years so it seemed to me that some new direction was needed.

1 So we went this scholarship route. There are 77 institu-
2 tions in 31 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.
3 This, I think, puts in some needed flexibility.

4 Quite frankly, I find myself again in agreement with
5 Senator Pell when he observed at the 1963 hearings:

6 I believe we can do the job of better preparing those who
7 represent us abroad by better utilizing existing facilities in
8 our great universities and by better utilizing and expanding the
9 facilities of the Foreign Service Institute...We should increase
10 the number of our Government people attending the Institute,
11 as well as sending our foreign affairs people to our universities.

12 My bill continues the Foreign Service Institute, and by
13 bringing it into the scope of the Higher Education Act offers
14 the opportunity to greatly strengthen it.

15 Let me list briefly the chief characteristics and advantages
16 I see in this new approach.

17 First. It utilizes, rather than competes with, the
18 facilities and academic expertise of educational institutions,
19 public and private, while preserving their control and
20 objectiveness.

21 Second. It offers varied but carefully coordinated under-
22 graduate and graduate programs including field training for
23 student scholarship recipients as well as inservice training
24 and research.

25 Third. It harnesses a continual and prepared reservoir of

1 representative talent from diverse sectors of American life
2 with a variety of educational backgrounds from many colleges
3 and universities.

4 Fourth. It provides access to the full breadth of
5 disciplines taught by the top minds of the country.

6 Fifth. It maintains the desirable flexibility and
7 independence to maximize opportunities for charting new courses
8 and altering old ones in foreign affairs education and
9 practice.

10 Sixth. It concentrates our investment in people instead
11 of property, avoiding large capital outlays for buildings,
12 grounds and equipment.

13 The bill refers to not more than 3,500 undergraduate
14 scholarships, and not more than 1,500 graduate scholarships.
15 In other words, these are ceiling figures. The Board of
16 Trustees is required to consult with the various Government
17 departments as to their personnel needs in making projections
18 of requirements for future employees, and determining whether
19 100 or 1,000 scholarships are to be awarded.

20 The scholarships are not intended to be limited solely to
21 those who are residing or will be residing overseas. Nor are
22 they intended to be limited solely to those directly involved
23 in making foreign policy.

24 There are many employees residing in the United States who
25 assist in the management of our international affairs programs

1 and have contact with citizens of other countries.

2 There are many employees abroad. Some are technicians.
3 Some are in communications. There are a variety of other
4 occupations. Certainly I am trying to reach these people with
5 the scholarship program as well as those who may be directly
6 involved in making foreign policy.

7 I must comment for the record that some of the agencies
8 I have been in touch with concerning these hearings have left
9 me with a feeling of amazement. Some seemed surprised at the
10 number of employees they had overseas. Others expressed the
11 feeling that since they only had a few hundred employees in
12 this capacity, the bill would be of little importance to them.
13 I could not disagree more.

14 It may be helpful to put in perspective the economics and
15 efficiency I foresee with the Corps Program. As a point of
16 comparison, let us consider the costs involved at the military
17 academies. The Special Subcommittee on Service Academies of
18 the House Armed Services Committee held hearings on this subject
19 in the 90th Congress. The cost of commissioning each student
20 at the Naval Academy in FY 1967 was \$40,200, at the Military
21 Academy, \$48,697 and at the Air Force Academy, \$50,933.

22 On the other hand, the ROTC Program -- which uses a system
23 of scholarships similar to that in my bill -- costs the American
24 taxpayer about \$7,500 per student up to the date of his
25 commission.

1 Mr. Chairman, there is one other observation I would like
2 to make for the hearing record. It involves the State Depart-
3 ment.

4 Since these hearings were announced, I am advised State
5 Department representatives have put a great deal of pressure
6 on other departments and agencies -- which I will not identify --
7 either urging them not to appear to testify on the bill or to
8 defer judgment solely to the State Department.

9 I must say I am a little perturbed even though I have
10 always held the view that the State Department feels it is the
11 sole fountain of knowledge when it comes to contact with
12 citizens of other countries.

13 A second item, however, causes me greater concern. After
14 obtaining the tentative witness list for these hearings by a
15 telephone call to my office, an employee of the State Department
16 was in touch with one of those listed. Again, I do not want
17 to identify names. The record I think will show this pretty
18 conclusively.

19 I will let those who read the record be their own judge.

20 Mr. Chairman, just a brief word for the hearing record
21 concerning the parliamentary situation on the bill. It was
22 reported favorably by the Senate Education Subcommittee and the
23 Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in July, 1968, along
24 with other new titles to the Higher Education Act. I think it
25 was the Vocational Education Act.

1 When the bill reached the floor that year, committee
2 jurisdiction was contested by the Foreign Relations Committee.
3 With assurances for public hearings on the bill, I reluctantly
4 moved to strike it on the floor of the Senate in July, 1968.

5 I have agreed that following completion of consideration
6 of this measure by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare
7 Committee, I will ask that it be referred to the Foreign
8 Relations Committee under a mutually satisfactory arrangement
9 to be made at that time. I have discussed this with various
10 people on the Foreign Relations Committee.

11 However, I continue to feel this scholarship program was
12 just as properly referred to our committee as was the Inter-
13 national Education Act of 1966.

14 To conclude, Mr. Chairman, we do not yet have a coordinated
15 and efficient system for training personnel from all agencies
16 who work with citizens of other countries. The independent
17 efforts of the many departments and agencies cannot meet the
18 challenge.

19 No other events in our lifetime will serve so well to mark
20 the smallness of the earth as will the achievements of Apollo
21 VIII, Apollo XI, and Apollo XII. The need for men to live
22 together in peace and understanding has been awakened in America
23 and around the globe.

24 The United States needs to listen as well as to act and
25 employees of our Government who have contact with citizens of

1 other countries need the finest possible training to insure
2 our ability to listen and understand, and to insure our
3 capacity to persuade others of our search for peace.

4 In closing, let me read for the record the words of
5 Astronaut Frank Borman, written after his return from the moon:

6 "The view of the earth from the moon fascinated me -- a
7 small disk, 240,000 miles away. It was hard to think that that
8 little thing held so many problems, so many frustrations.
9 Raging nationalistic interests, famines, wars, pestilence don't
10 show from that distance.

11 I am convinced that some wayward stranger in a spacecraft,
12 coming from some other part of the heavens, could look at
13 earth and never know that it was inhabited at all. But the same
14 wayward stranger would certainly know instinctively that if the
15 earth were inhabited, then the destinies of all who lived on it
16 must inevitably be interwoven and joined. We are one hunk of
17 ground, water, air, clouds, floating around in space. From
18 out there it really is one world."

19 Mr. Chairman, I have received and am expecting some
20 letters of comment on the bill and I would like to have the
21 Subcommittee's permission to submit those for the hearing record.

22 Finally, I would like to request that the following tables
23 be printed in the hearing record at this point.

24 With American leadership and overseas concern, with our
25 role as the leader of the free world, with our continued

1 involvement with nations in all areas of the world, it seems to
2 me that the people who are working for our Government overseas
3 and in contact with other people should have the best training
4 that we can provide for them. This, after all, may be the first
5 step in trying to understand what this country is about and
6 what it is trying to do.

7 I sincerely appreciate your willingness to let me make this
8 statement. I would like to request that certain tables be
9 printed in the hearing record at this point.

10 Senator Pell. They will be printed in the hearing record
11 and in addition to that, I wonder if the staff could put in the
12 cost for the Coast Guard Academy and the Merchant Marine
13 Academy.

14 (The documents to be furnished follow:)

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Senator Pell. I congratulate the Senator from Col
2 on all the work he has put into this and the knowledge he has
3 and the comprehensiveness of the grasp of the problem and as
4 was said earlier, my mind is completely open on it.

5 I am delighted to be able to afford his bill and him the
6 courtesy of these harings. No man has pursued a thing in which
7 he believes more than Senator Dominick has. I know how very
8 much indeed strongly he believes in this program idea.

9 The first witness is Mr. Mace of the Department of State.

10 STATEMENT OF HOWARD MACE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL,
11 FOREIGN SERVICE (ACCOMPANIED BY: JOSEPH TONER,
12 DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL AND MANPOWER, A.I.D., AND DR.
13 GEORGE HILDEBRAND, DEPUTY UNDERSECRETARY FOR INTER-
14 NATIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.)

15 Mr. Mace. I don't have any prepared statement, Mr.
16 Chairman. I will, if you wish, read the letter which the
17 Department sent to the Chairman and the committee yesterday,
18 if I may.

19 Senator Pell. How long is that?

20 Mr. Mace. It is a little over two pages.

21 Senator Pell. We will put the letter in the record at
22 this point.

23 (The letter to be furnished follows:)

1 Senator Pell. I would like to put to you the direct
2 question: first, if you can speak for the Administration, does
3 the Administration favor or oppose this bill?

4 Mr. Mace. The Administration, as I understand it, sir,
5 opposes the enactment of the bill in the sense that it doesn't
6 feel that the legislation is necessary to supply the personnel
7 that are needed for the Department of State and the other
8 agencies.

9 Senator Pell. Have you consulted with the Bureau of the
10 Budget?

11 Mr. Mace. Yes.

12 Senator Pell. Do they share your views?

13 Mr. Mace. Yes.

14 Senator Pell. Do you speak for the Administration or for
15 the Department of State?

16 Mr. Mace. I speak for the Department of State, but the
17 comments in our letter do reflect the position of the
18 Administration.

19 Senator Pell. I know Senator Dominick will want to question
20 you in a little bit in this regard. Would you give us a brief
21 outline for your reasons for objections?

22 Mr. Mace. First of all, we don't believe that it is
23 necessary to have an additional authority to obtain qualified
24 younger officers for the Foreign Affairs community in that we
25 find that there are ample applicants among the university

1 graduates, including graduate students, to compete for the
2 present competitive examinations for appointment.

3 Another point is that we feel that the legislation with
4 respect to the status of the Foreign Service Institute may
5 present us with problems in terms of the Secretary of State's
6 responsibilities under the Foreign Service Act to direct the
7 activities of the Foreign Service Institute, which as we
8 understand, the bill as it was written, would provide that the
9 Foreign Service Institute be transferred to the jurisdiction
10 of the board of trustees that is established by the legislation.

11 Those are the two basic points that our letter makes.

12 Senator Pell. As you know, I was once upon a time a
13 young Foreign Service officer, and I have interest in this.
14 I followed the trials and tribulations of the Service.

15 You may proceed, Mr. Toner.

16 Mr. Toner. Mr. Chairman, I am Joseph Toner, Director of
17 Personnel and Manpower of A.I.D.

18 I am pleased to appear before you today to testify on
19 S. 939, a bill "to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in
20 order to provide for a United States Foreign Service Corps."

21 The Agency for International Development recognizes the
22 need for greater awareness on the part of Americans of the
23 cultures, economic needs, political conditions, and aspirations
24 of the people of other countries, particularly in those
25 countries less developed economically than the United States.

1 The proposed bill would provide more of this awareness.

2 There is some question as to the usefulness to A.I.D. of
3 an education program such as proposed in S. 939. The AGENCY
4 is now undergoing some major organizational changes due to the
5 creation of two Government corporations which will assume parts
6 of the A.I.D. program. Still further changes can be anticipated
7 as a result of the study being made by the Presidential Task
8 Force on International Development Cooperation headed by
9 Rudolph A. Peterson.

10 In view of these changes we can only discuss the bill in
11 light of past programs and operations.

12 A.I.D. is now providing Government-to-Government assistance
13 to approximately 40 of the less developed countries. In carrying
14 out the program we employ Foreign Service Reserve Officers in
15 20 technical fields of activity, exclusive of the general
16 administration and management area.

17 These employees work directly with the cooperating
18 countries' ministries, which normally assign their best
19 technicians to work as counterparts with A.I.D. employees.
20 A.I.D. has been required under this arrangement to provide
21 highly skilled professionals in the various technical fields in
22 which we provide assistance.

23 Our need for young college graduates is, therefore,
24 extremely limited. Each year we bring in approximately 50
25 interns to train for programming, loan management, and general

1 administration. Even this limited number is difficult to place
2 as many of our mission staffs are small and trainees can be
3 placed only in the larger missions which have senior staff
4 members to support them.

5 It has been the experience of the Agency that the training
6 needs of the overseas employee are much greater than for persons
7 employed in the United States because he does not have the
8 advantage of frequent communication with others in his pro-
9 fession.

10 To meet this need, the Congress amended the Foreign
11 Assistance Act in 1957 to permit similar training to that
12 proposed in Sec. 1207 of the proposed bill. This provision
13 also includes authority for a personnel interchange with State
14 and local governments, public or private non-profit institutions
15 commercial firms, and trade and scientific associations.

16 Under this authority A.I.D. is currently using non-
17 Government facilities for refresher training, long term non-
18 degree training, special institutes for mid-career employees,
19 population seminars, and some language training. The costs
20 per trainee vary from program to program.

21 For example, our Mid-Career Institute conducted by
22 Syracuse University averages \$1,270 per trainee for a four
23 week course; population seminars average \$365 per trainee;
24 long term academic training averages \$2,800 for a nine month
25 period and language training averages \$1,200 for eight weeks.

1 The Agency's in-house training programs include the
2 International Development Intern Program, orientation to A.I.D.,
3 program management, management improvement, clerical and
4 communication training. The average cost per trainee for the
5 in-house training runs from \$56 for clerical and communications
6 training per week to \$145 for the management improvement
7 program per week.

8 In addition, A.I.D. utilizes FSI for language training,
9 area studies, the senior seminar, economic studies and the
10 special Vietnam training program.

11 The Agency also provides training for its local personnel
12 who provide most of the clerical and sub-professional support
13 required by the missions. Much of this training is carried
14 out on the job by the mission staff at no extra cost to the
15 Government. American secretaries do an excellent job of
16 assisting the local personnel in modern office techniques.

17 The Agency conducts a variety of workshops for local
18 personnel in such fields as supply management and training.
19 This training is conducted in the United States and in the
20 missions by A.I.D./W and mission personnel knowledgeable of
21 the Agency's and country's problems and policies.

22 A.I.D. Foreign Service employees are recruited from all
23 over the United States. During the recent drive to staff the
24 mission in Vietnam, the Agency sent recruitment representatives
25 to every State in the continental United States. Our records

1 show that the Foreign Service Reserve employees alone hold
2 graduate and undergraduate degrees from more than 600 colleges
3 and universities.

4 A.I.D. also uses personnel of other Government agencies in
5 the implementation of its programs abroad. The Departments of
6 Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare,
7 Treasury, Interior and many independent agencies carry out
8 numerous types of projects for the agency.

9 Unfortunately, we do not have comparable data available
10 on these personnel. They do, however, provide technical skills
11 and backstopping which are not available on the A.I.D. direct
12 hire staff.

13 In summary, we think that A.I.D. has, throughout its
14 history, included in its Foreign Service a broad representation
15 of the U.S. population, technical skills and educational
16 facilities. Our present legislation provides us with the
17 authority we need to train and up-date the skills of our own
18 personnel as well as the personnel of the other agencies of
19 the Government who participate in our program.

20 We believe that the full utilization of our present
21 legislative authority would permit us to meet the needs of the
22 Agency as we see them at this time without recourse to
23 additional legislation.

24 Thank you, sir.

25 Senator Pell. Dr. Hildebrand, you may proceed.

1 Dr. Hildebrand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 I am George Hildebrand, Deputy Undersecretary of Labor
3 for International Affairs. I also sit on the Board of Foreign
4 Service representing the Department of Labor.

5 With your permission, rather than read my statement, I
6 can simply summarize it, the reason being that it deals with
7 the relatively narrow involvement of the Department of Labor
8 in the Foreign Service.

9 Senator Pell. The statement will appear in the record as
10 if read.

11 (The statement referred to follows:)

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Dr. Hildebrand. The Department of Labor is involved in
2 the Foreign Service essentially in three ways.

3 One is that I sit on the Board of Foreign Service. Another
4 is that we supply experts who sit on the Board of Examiners,
5 and third, we have co-responsibilities with the Department of
6 State having to do with the labor attache program as part of
7 the Foreign Service. It is to that program I would like to
8 direct my principal remarks.

9 There are less than 100 attaches or labor reporting
10 officers today. This means that it is not a large component
11 of the Foreign Service, as such. However, it is an important
12 component in terms of the service involved, because of the fact
13 that these attaches are responsible for reporting on labor and
14 manpower problems and developments within the countries and
15 regions to which they are assigned and for that reason require
16 considerable expertise and supply information to this country
17 that is of importance to our Government.

18 These labor attaches are somewhat an unusual group in that
19 they don't necessarily represent university trained people in
20 all instances.

21 In the early days of the Corps, a number of them were
22 recruited directly from the trained union movement in the
23 United States, but that has ceased to be possible because of
24 the contraction in the total size of this group, and therefore,
25 the inability to bring in fresh people at this time because the

1 budget and other considerations do not permit this.

2 We cooperate with the Department of State in the training
3 of these labor attaches in various ways. One is that we will
4 have three to five middle range Foreign Service officers
5 detailed to us each year and they will spend nine or ten months
6 in the Department of Labor learning the trade, so to speak,
7 that is the activities of the Department and all of their
8 complexity, so as to prepare them in their chosen field of
9 specialization.

10 We also provide a one-week seminar to the broader based
11 group of Foreign Service persons. This is done in order to
12 see that all Foreign Service officers at least have some
13 acquaintance with labor matters, labor history and labor
14 institutions in the United States.

15 In addition, on occasion, attaches are sent on a rather
16 short notice basis to receive intensive training at our hands
17 as part of their preparation for a position which will require
18 labor reporting.

19 This really describes I think adequately the basic work
20 the Department does. I should remind you that the Department of
21 Labor is involved in other overseas matters such as ILO, NDP
22 and OECD, but these don't present problems to us in terms of
23 availability of personnel.

24 That, therefore, will describe, I think, the essence of
25 what I have to say in this statement.

Senator Pell. One other question directed to Mr. Mace.

I realize that it may be slightly sensitive. But one of the agencies that does have representatives abroad is the Central Intelligence Agency.

In coordinating your statement, were you in contact with them?

Mr. Mace. No, sir.

Senator Pell. I wonder if they have a view about this bill?

Mr. Mace. I honestly don't know.

Senator Pell. As you well know, they have a certain number of people abroad. I think if there are any differing views on the part of the Central Intelligence Agency, maybe you would make them known to the committee.

If, on the other hand, they are the same as yours, we will presume you will have contacted them and that that is the case.

Mr. Mace. Yes, sir.

Senator Pell. I will turn over the proceedings to the principal sponsor of the bill, and Senator Dominick, and I am glad to see Senator Javits back also.

Senator Dominick. Senator Javits?

Senator Javits. I would like for you to proceed, Senator.

Senator Dominick. Mr. Mace, I read over the letter which the Department sent to Senator Yarborough. I would like to add

1 just a couple of questions.

2 I gathered from your opening statement here that one of
3 the basic objections you have is the transfer of the Institute
4 over to the new board created under this bill. Is that
5 correct?

6 Mr. Mace. Yes, sir.

7 Senator Dominick. If that were eliminated and that left
8 it within the control of the Department of State, as it now
9 is, would that be one of the major objections the State
10 Department has?

11 Mr. Mace. It would certainly satisfy that objection.

12 Senator Dominick. Would the State Department still have
13 a number of objections to the bill?

14 Mr. Mace. Yes.

15 Senator Dominick. Those objections would be based on what,
16 the language or on just what you consider as the lack of need?

17 Mr. Mace. Lack of need.

18 Senator Dominick. Is the lack of need restricted again
19 to the question of the promotion or the training of Foreign
20 Service officers or does it involve lack of need in other
21 agencies? If so, how do you know about them?

22 Mr. Mace. I can only speak for the Department of State
23 with respect to our needs. More specifically, we find that in
24 the last four fiscal years, we have had an average of about
25 125 junior officer appointments each year. We have had in each

1 case up to three and 4,000 applicants for the examination.

2 So that we feel that the universities are turning out
3 people who are interested in Foreign Affairs and who are
4 willing to take our competitive examinations, and that the
5 numbers far exceed now under the present system, without any
6 cost to the Government candidates who are fully qualified.

7 Senator Dominick. Certainly, you don't want to limit or
8 restrict the number of people that apply, do you?

9 Mr. Mace. No.

10 Senator Dominick. The interest in this, I presume, would
11 be quite gratifying?

12 Mr. Mace. Yes, we are gratified with the interest that
13 has been maintained.

14 Senator Dominick. I would think under those circumstances
15 if this was designed as it is to try to stimulate further
16 interest in this, that this would be welcomed by the State
17 Department.

18 Mr. Mace. Yes.

19 Senator Dominick. It is giving you a broader scope.
20 People from the various institutions around the country who
21 have even more interest in this problem than they have now.

22 Mr. Mace. I think that is true.

23 Senator Dominick. We debated for quite a period of time
24 as to what to do about the Institute. We decided that since
25 this was designed to be a fairly all encompassing bill, it would

1 put this provision in. It is not necessary to the scope of
2 the bill to have that. We could amend it to take that out.

3 I think as a matter of fact, it probably would decrease
4 the number of problems that we have got if we did take it out.
5 But, nevertheless, I have been through the Foreign Service
6 Institute on several occasions and we are going to have some
7 witnesses who will testify specifically on that before we are
8 through.

9 In general, then, you would say that you are simply saying
10 that the bill has probably a good directive but that you have
11 enough people now. Therefore, you don't see any additional
12 need for it?

13 Mr. Mace. Yes, sir.

14 Senator Dominick. This is of interest to me since the
15 exhibit that we have and which I have already put in the record
16 shows that we have a total of 42,332 U.S. citizens serving
17 abroad, not counting the ones who live here and are in constant
18 contact with them. Surely you don't say that the Institute or
19 the State Department gives training to all those people?

20 Mr. Mace. No, sir.

21 Senator Dominick. We have, I might say, Mr. Toner, almost
22 11,000 people in State, including A.I.D. and Peace Corps, and
23 specifically in the A.I.D., we have 4146 U.S. citizens living
24 abroad.

25 Mr. Toner. Yes, sir.

1 Senator Dominick. Do I gather that you think it is
2 better to have these people do these jobs on the basis of on-
3 the-job training?

4 Mr. Toner. No, sir. I did not mean to convey that.

5 Senator Dominick. That is specifically what you say in
6 your testimony.

7 Mr. Toner. Perhaps I could expand, Senator. We do have a
8 variety of training programs, both in-house and academic which
9 our employees now have access to. The point I was trying to
10 stress is that given a turnover rate of roughly 400 persons a
11 year in our offices grouping and an input of only 50 per year
12 of youngsters just out of college, we don't see a continuing
13 present need of much magnitude to meet our current requirements.

14 The 50 people who come in and the others who we recruit
15 at mid-levels can be trained within our existing facilities,
16 we believe.

17 Senator Dominick. I was interested in your comment on
18 the special Vietnam training program. I just returned from
19 Vietnam, where I had the privilege of meeting with your A.I.D.
20 personnel. As you know, until fairly recently we had very
21 substantial trouble over there with regard to both management
22 and direction of many of our A.I.D. personnel.

23 The point I am making is that I am sure that every agency
24 would like to say, "We are going to set up our own training
25 curriculum" and this is going to be true. It has been true

1 universally since the time of Caesar, that every department
2 wants to set up their own training program for their own people
3 and understandably so.

4 My effort here is not to try and give specific expertise
5 to each separate department on asking a person 17 years old of
6 making up his mind what he is going to do when he is 25, but
7 give them the broad background to understand what we are trying
8 to do overseas in the various agencies.

9 It would seem to me that this is something that could be
10 very helpful in particularly your upper management level. Do
11 you have any comment on that?

12 Mr. Toner. In summary, Senator, I would try to make a
13 point that most of the people that we recruit into our programs
14 are recruited at the mid-level rather than junior. We try to
15 find people who are already trained, who are already expert,
16 who will serve in a specialized technical assistance role, who
17 may not stay with us very long, but who will fit in the
18 immediate need that we have.

19 Thus, when we recruit them, we try to look for people who
20 are already highly qualified and thus our training programs
21 for them are not as great as they would be if we were picking
22 up the bulk of our employees at a more junior level.

23 Senator Dominick. This wouldn't prevent that, would it?

24 Mr. Toner. No, sir.

25 Senator Dominick. You could still go ahead with that.

1 Mr. Mace, coming back to the State Department letter, you
2 say that the Corps that we have envisaged here in this bill
3 could impose a real obstacle to open competition in the final
4 selection of Class 7 and 8 Foreign Service officers.

5 You go on to say that there is some reason to believe that
6 the Corps members would be in a preferred position in taking
7 the Foreign Service exam.

8 You use the words "could conceivably and some reason to
9 believe" and although I know this is standard phraseology
10 used by the State Department on a number of occasions, what
11 do you mean by that as far as the bill is concerned? How does
12 it give them any preferred position or conceivably jeopardize
13 the class of open competition?

14 Mr. Mace. My feeling was in reading the bill, sir, that
15 if the Federal Government in effect supported the training of
16 one of the 3500 or one of the 1500 maximum students envisaged
17 under the program, that that individual would assume, and I
18 think quite properly assume, that at the end of his Government-
19 paid education, he would have a priority right of some sort to
20 enter the Foreign Service.

21 Senator Dominick. But they are not going all into the
22 Foreign Service.

23 Mr. Mace. I mean the Foreign Service in the larger sense.

24 Senator Dominick. Some of them will be going into
25 Commerce, some into Agriculture, some will be going into the

1 FAA.

2 Mr. Mace. I am guilty of a little mistaken semantics.
3 I mean the foreign service community, people engaged in the
4 Government related to foreign affairs.

5 Senator Dominick. If they have had specialized training
6 in this, don't you think they would probably do better in that
7 competition?

8 Mr. Mace. I think they might. But at the same time, the
9 fact that they have done better might work to the disadvantage
10 of the man who has paid his own way.

11 Senator Dominick. I don't see that. If a man pays his own
12 way and you have got a limited number of scholarships around
13 the country and he is just as bright as the other guy, I don't
14 see any distinction there. At least there is no distinction
15 going into the bill.

16 Senator Javits. Senator, would you yield?

17 Senator Dominick. Yes.

18 Senator Javits. I wanted to ask a question of fact.

19 I would be very interested -- as I am a member, like
20 Senator Pell, both of this committee and the Foreign Relations,
21 and indeed, I am ranking member of this committee -- in the
22 evolution of the system that you now use.

23 How has it changed, let us say since World War I when the
24 United States really became a world power? How are those
25 changes related to the foreign policy problems of the United

1 States?

2 I think that that might be a very interesting thing
3 because I think I understand what Senator Dominick is getting
4 at. I am very sympathetic to it. He really wants to bring
5 the Foreign Service Corps down to the people's level, which is
6 very much like we do with our own services. It is part of the
7 genius of the American military systems in the terms of the
8 people it turns out as a result. It may be false in the way
9 it is done and we don't want to destroy what we have accomplished.

10 It is a fact that the Foreign Service officers are
11 generally college graduates and you have got to have been some
12 before you can become a Foreign Service officer. That isn't
13 necessarily right.

14 But I do think that perhaps if we got a little of the
15 thinking of the Department as to how its system has developed
16 and it is satisfactory, and I assume that that is what this
17 reflects, the satisfaction of the existing system, as it relates
18 to the ways in which these Foreign Service officers are fed into
19 the stream, we might be very much helped.

20 Also, I think Senator Dominick's bill ought to have
21 coupled with it an analysis of exactly what is the interface
22 between officers of other departments who have important foreign
23 relations responsibilities, labor attaches, agriculture attaches,
24 even military attaches, and again, as their importance has grown,
25 how the Department feels that its system has kept pace with that.

1 I think if we had that, we all might be in a better
2 position to analyze what is being done here. We may find that
3 some new needs are highly desirable, which is the first con-
4 sideration. That is rather my instinct more than my finding
5 of fact and then proceed from that to see, in collaboration
6 even with the Department, what that new need would be. I am
7 sure the Secretary of State at present would agree with the
8 present state of the world and with the egalitarian nature of
9 the society, it is not a good idea to confine the opportunities
10 solely to the college graduate.

11 I think that is essentially what Senator Dominick is
12 driving at. So would you be kind enough to submit some analysis
13 of the thinking of the Department as to how the broadened
14 responsibilities which I have described relate to the system,
15 and secondly, what accommodation the system has for a non-elite
16 opening, or an opening for a non-elite American?

17 Mr. Mace. I would be pleased to do so, sir.

18 (The information to be furnished follows:)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Senator Dominick. Mr. Mace, you refer from time to time
2 about training programs that the State Department has been able
3 to conduct. In how many areas do you have pre-employment
4 categories? In other words, do you have training or pre-employ-
5 ment requirements prior to the time that you take somebody on?

6 Mr. Mace. You are speaking of people we are proposing to
7 hire?

8 Senator Dominick. Yes.

9 Mr. Mace. We have no programs at our expense for the
10 pre-training of potential employees.

11 Senator Dominick. That is what I thought. That is why it
12 seemed to me that maybe this is another reason for passage of
13 the bill, which you do have some pre-training here prior to the
14 time that the selection process even gets underway. It seemed
15 to me that that might be of some assistance.

16 Mr. Mace. I think, sir, I don't believe we have any
17 legislative authority at the present time to engage in any
18 pre-employment training.

19 Senator Dominick. That is what I had hoped you would say,
20 in fact.

21 Is my understanding correct that the State Department at
22 the present time in respect to Foreign Service officers can
23 send them to colleges or universities for upgrading?

24 Mr. Mace. Yes, sir.

25 Senator Dominick. That authority does not extend, as I

1 understand it, to other agencies of Government, does it?

2 Mr. Mace. I believe it does now, yes, sir. I think in
3 the last few years there has been legislation authorizing
4 practically all Government agencies to send their employees
5 to universities for training.

6 Senator Dominick. How many other agencies in fact do get
7 this opportunity? Do you know?

8 Mr. Mace. I know that A.I.D. does, U.S.I.A. does, Labor
9 does, Commerce does. I think a great many agencies do, sir.

10 Senator Dominick. Those are paid for out of the budget
11 of the respective agencies, not by State?

12 Mr. Mace. That is right.

13 Senator Dominick. In 1961, the incoming Kennedy Administra-
14 tion created two separate advisory bodies, the President's
15 Advisory Panel on the National Academy of Foreign Affairs under
16 the chairmanship of Mr. Perkins, and the Committee on Foreign
17 Affairs Personnel, chaired by former Secretary of State, Mr.
18 Herter.

19 Both groups concluded that "The Foreign Service Institute
20 itself was parochial and at times excessively concerned with
21 State Department operations and inadequate in providing in-
22 service training." This is the reply that they get.

23 Specifically, what has been done to correct those problems
24 since that time, if you know? This I think bears a little bit
25 on what Senator Javits was saying as to what changes had been

1 made.

2 Mr. Mace. I was not here at the time that you are talking
3 about. I was abroad during the activities of the committee
4 appointed by President Kennedy.

5 I would say, and I believe you would confirm this, sir,
6 that the Foreign Service Institute now first of all enjoys
7 excellent physical facilities. They have a very fine plant
8 in which the Institute is located.

9 I think that the quality of the staff of the Foreign Service
10 Institute in terms of educational background of its staff and
11 their capabilities has been enhanced considerably since those
12 committee reports have been made.

13 At the present time we don't have a Director of the Foreign
14 Service Institute with the retirement of Ambassador Hart who
15 was the last Director. I think Ambassador Hart and before him,
16 Ambassador Allen, brought a new and distinguished leadership to
17 the Foreign Service Institute that had not been present in
18 earlier years.

19 I trust that we will be able to appoint a highly qualified
20 individual to direct the Foreign Service Institute. As a matter
21 of fact, the Undersecretary has appointed a committee to look
22 into the question of appointing the properly qualified educator
23 to head the Foreign Service Institute.

24 I think that the Foreign Service Institute during the past
25 few years has improved its capability of meeting the in-service

1 training needs of our personnel and those of approximately 30
2 agencies who do at the present time send students to Foreign
3 Service Institute.

4 I think particularly our program of economic training has
5 gone quite a ways in meeting the needs of upgrading the quality
6 of our economic commercial officers, and we have done that
7 jointly with the Department of Commerce. I have had a statement
8 with them fairly recently in which I think it is fair to con-
9 clude that both they and our economic officers in the Department
10 are satisfied with the quality of that particular type of
11 training.

12 Senator Dominick. We will have Mr. Hart and Mr. Allen
13 on as witnesses later on. I look forward to their testimony.

14 In your letter, you say you have about 8,000 employee
15 family members per year from other Government agencies which
16 go through this. Most of that consists of language instruction
17 and basic briefings regarding the country of their assignment?

18 Mr. Mace. A majority of it does, yes, sir. I have a
19 breakdown of the types of training and the number of students.

20 Senator Dominick. I think this would be helpful to put
21 that in the record at this point.

22 Senator Pell. Without objection, it will be placed in the
23 record at this point.

24 (The information to be furnished follows:)
25

1 Senator Dominick. Do you have any idea of cost per
2 enrollee of the F.S.I.?

3 Mr. Mace. I don't have that with me. I know their annual
4 budget runs roughly \$10 million a year, of which a substantial
5 portion, I believe about one-third, comes from the appropriations
6 of other agencies who send their students to the Foreign Service
7 Institute.

8 I don't know that. I can get figures for all the different
9 types, but the major categories I can certainly provide.

10 Senator Dominick. You have also objected in here to what
11 you say is the lack of flexibility, because we say that one
12 year during every five, foreign service people should come back
13 to the United States.

14 At the present time, the Foreign Service Act requires that
15 they spend three out of 15 in the United States. You say this
16 restricts flexibility?

17 Mr. Mace. Yes, sir.

18 Senator Dominick. Actually, under that circumstance, the
19 general tour is four years anyhow, isn't it?

20 Mr. Mace. Yes. It is broken by home leave in between,
21 within the middle of the period.

22 Senator Dominick. Three and 15 is one for five, just
23 about, anyhow. So there isn't very much difference.

24 Mr. Mace. I think the point is that the present legal
25 requirement is that an officer must serve during his first 15

1 years of service three years in the continental United States.
2 What we try to do is to make that one block of three years
3 rather than bringing him back more frequently than that because
4 it is very expensive to transfer a man and his family at
5 frequent intervals.

6 Senator Dominick. The average tour abroad, however, is
7 about four years. Does this mean that you keep a person 12
8 years?

9 Mr. Mace. I don't think it is quite that high. It runs
10 somewhere around 27 to 30 months, as the average. Of course,
11 our average has been upset quite dramatically in the last few
12 years with the reductions that we have suffered.

13 Senator Pell. It occurs to me that what we are groping
14 with here is almost a philosophical question as to whether the
15 input in the Foreign Service, whether the United States interest
16 is advanced by having the people coming into the Foreign Service
17 with already some ideas of training of U.S. objectives abroad,
18 or whether it is better to sacrifice that and concentrate on
19 really as completely diverse a spread as possible for when they
20 come in.

21 This is a question of which there can be honest disagreement.
22 I think speaking, I still try and stay in touch with the
23 thinking of the Foreign Service, one of the problems of the
24 young Foreign Service officer faces is they come in rather
25 excitedly and they discover very often that their initial job

1 is really not up to their training and their capacity and
2 their expectations. They had thought that everyone has an
3 attaches case when he enters.

4 I think it is a very wrong kind of consent. I don't think
5 the people go into the clergy with the idea of becoming a
6 bishop. I think the Foreign Service would be much healthier
7 if the young men came in because they believe in the life of
8 service, a life of travel and went in for that reason rather
9 than setting their sights too high and then they find they are
10 getting disappointed.

11 The result is today, in the early stages of the Foreign
12 Service, you are losing your best young men from boredom and
13 your best young men who are efficient and you are keeping the
14 broad middle spectrum. I think our objective here is while we
15 continue to lose the bottom portion, we keep that top portion.

16 I look at the classes when I joined the Service and the
17 fellows with perhaps the most imagination are not those who
18 have stuck with the Service through the loss of our national
19 interest. These are just general observations. I don't know
20 if they recall any comments on your part or not.

21 Mr. Mace. I think in general I would agree with your
22 comment, Senator.

23 I think that we should and we are in the process of
24 making some changes which we hope will lessen that trend.

25 Senator Pell. I read Ambassador McComber's speech

1 carefully and congratulated him on it. As you know, there has
2 been thought of a commission approaching this whole problem
3 and it is almost time for it by now, and I hope this is not
4 just a means of forestalling that. I think all the changes that
5 are needed to be made can be made within the Foreign Service
6 with the legislation we presently have. One of the great
7 problems you face is you haven't taken full advantage of the
8 legislation we have.

9 The original War Manpower Act of 1946 gave you complete
10 flexibility. I think probably what Senator Dominick is seeking
11 to cope with here could have been not a problem if the full
12 authority under the legislation could be exercised by the
13 Department.

14 Thank you.

15 Senator Dominick. Mr. Mace, do you have any statistics
16 showing how a newly recruited Foreign Service officer stands
17 on any national scale, such as a comparison on the College
18 Board exams or the graduate record exams or anything of that
19 kind?

20 Mr. Mace. No, sir, I don't have that. I believe I can
21 provide data which can relate to that.

22 Senator Pell. As a matter of observation, the standard is
23 fantastically high -- the fellows who graduate from college
24 now and the ones who can pass this exam.

25 Senator Dominick. If we can get this data, I think it would

1 be helpful to give us some idea of the comparability.

2 Mr. Mace. Yes.

3 Senator Pell. I agree.

4 (The information to be furnished follows:)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Dominick. Again, I don't know whether you have
2 this. But if you have, I think it would be helpful -- a
3 comparison of how the incoming Foreign Service officers compare
4 with other groups entering Government service, or similar
5 professions in the private sector. I don't know whether you
6 have that or not.

7 Mr. Mace. No, sir, I don't. Do you mean comparison with
8 respect to intelligence and numbers of degrees?

9 Senator Dominick. I was thinking in terms of relative
10 ranges, and the degree level which they have gotten prior to
11 the time that they entered the service and this kind of thing?

12 Mr. Mace. Compared say with junior attorneys being
13 employed?

14 Senator Dominick. Yes, if you have an attorney coming in
15 for example, how does he compare with the people who are going
16 into an international firm. I don't know whether you have got
17 any records of that kind. You might take a look.

18 Mr. Mace. All right. I know we have done some work on
19 that with the Department of Labor earlier in the past year.
20 I think I can provide some data.

21 (The information to be furnished follows:)

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Dominick. As to the one-day written exam which
2 has been instituted, does this show any trends in scores, for
3 example, as to the ability of the Foreign Service officers
4 which you have been recruiting? A one-day written exam is
5 fairly recent, I gather?

6 Mr. Mace. A one-day written exam has been given since
7 1946, with legislation that was passed then, which is our
8 basic legislation of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, which
9 established the present basic concepts of both the written and
10 oral examinations. They have been given with few exceptions
11 annually.

12 What that examination attempts to do is to in effect test
13 the general intelligence of the candidate and it is followed
14 by an oral examination, which is more directly designed to
15 determine aptitude and experience capability of performing
16 duties of the Foreign Service officer. So it is a two-part
17 examination, a written and an oral.

18 At the present time, Senator, it has three options: one
19 for the field of political science, one for economic and
20 commercial training and one for administrative management
21 training.

22 Senator Dominick. I wonder, to use the colloquial
23 expression, if you could give us any statistics on the dropout
24 rate over the past 10 or 15 years of the Foreign Service
25 officers?

1 Mr. Mace. You said dropout, you mean voluntary?

2 Senator Dominick. Yes.

3 Mr. Mace. Yes, sir, I can.

4 Senator Dominick. Both voluntary and involuntary.

5 Mr. Mace. I will be glad to provide that. We have done
6 some analysis of that. We find that our dropout rate compares
7 most favorably with other Government agencies. In other words,
8 we have a relatively low dropout rate.

9 Senator Dominick. I am glad to hear that. I think it
10 would be helpful if you could give us those figures.

11 Mr. Mace. Yes, sir.

12 (The information to be furnished follows:)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Dominick. One of the objections which have been
2 raised from time to time is the fact that this is designed
3 only to take care of employees who are going to be serving
4 overseas. Actually, it is also designed to take care of
5 citizens who are working within the United States but are in
6 really pretty constant touch with people overseas.

7 Do we have any list or does anybody have any list of those
8 people and who they are?

9 Mr. Mace. In the United States?

10 Senator Dominick. Yes.

11 Mr. Mace. No, sir, I don't. It could be obtained from
12 the agencies that are engaged in the field.

13 Senator Dominick. We will have to gather those from the
14 respective agencies, then?

15 Mr. Mace. Do I have a list of the agencies?

16 Senator Dominick. No, we would have to gather them from
17 the respective agencies?

18 Mr. Mace. I would be willing to undertake to get them
19 for you, sir.

20 Senator Dominick. If you can, I think this would be
21 helpful. I have a feeling it is going to be quite a massive
22 number of people.

23 Mr. Mace. Yes, I think we would have to agree upon the
24 terms of references of what we mean by people engaged in foreign
25 affairs. I wouldn't think you would assume for example you

1 would want all the people in the Pentagon who are related to
2 military operations abroad, but on the other hand, I am sure
3 you would want to include parts of the Department of Labor,
4 A.I.D., Department of Commerce, U.S.I.A. and others.

5 Senator Dominick. Yes.

6 Senator Pell. By others, do you mean the Central
7 Intelligence Agency?

8 Mr. Mace. Yes, sir. I think they should be included.

9 Senator Dominick. With all due respect, I wonder if we
10 wouldn't get into pretty sensitive ground on that, Mr. Chairman.
11 I am inclined to think if we didn't get into the CIA, we would
12 be better off on this particular type of question.

13 Senator Pell. Maybe it could be given to us on a
14 classified basis.

15 Senator Dominick. That would be all right with me. I
16 serve on the subcommittee.

17 (The information to be furnished follows:)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Mr. Mace. In this connection, Senator, may I ask that
2 the reporter give to me the sort of thing that Senator Javits
3 was asking so I have the full flavor of the thrust of his
4 questions and yours.

5 Senator Dominick. Correct. With respect to my question,
6 I am talking about those who work in administering international
7 affairs programs and in their department or have contact on
8 a regular basis with citizens of other countries in person or
9 by way of communication.

10 Mr. Mace. Right.

11 Senator Pell. You will receive a copy of the rough draft
12 of the testimony tomorrow and you can clean up any tiny
13 grammatical errors or even most substantive errors, in fact.

14 Mr. Mace. Thank you.

15 Senator Dominick. One further question as a matter of
16 information.

17 There are about 179,000 non-citizens who are employees of
18 our Government and in foreign countries. Do we give them any
19 specific educational programs or is it simply on-the-job
20 training by and large?

21 Mr. Mace. To my knowledge, it is almost exclusively on-
22 the-job training.

23 Senator Dominick. Thank you very much.

24 Senator Pell. Thank you very much, gentlemen.
25

1 Senator Pell. Our next witness is Dr. George Grassmuck,
2 Special Assistant to the Secretary for International Affairs,
3 Department of HEW.

4 Do you have a formal statement.

5 STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE GRASSMUCK,
6 SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,
7 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

8 Dr. Grassmuck. I do, Mr. Chairman. I have submitted it.
9 I believe that you have copies there. It is a rather extensive
10 statement. I could summarize it, if you choose.

11 Senator Pell. Certainly. It will be inserted in the
12 record in full. If you care to summarize it, it would be all
13 right.

14 (The statement referred to follows:)

1 Dr. Grassmuck. I am before you with a mixed education
2 background which I should state very succinctly. I have been
3 an academic administrator for some time. I served as an
4 assistant vice president for Academic Affairs at the University
5 of Michigan where I was in charge of international programs
6 before joining the present Administration of the Department of
7 Health, Education and Welfare.

8 For this reason, the testimony which I give you is based
9 upon several approaches or several facets of study of the topic
10 which the Senator from Colorado has in mind.

11 As you know, our Department is a domestic agency and as
12 such, we have concerned ourselves particularly with matters
13 which are of great importance in the United States. Insofar as
14 our external activities are concerned, we have followed the
15 lead of the Department of State and A.I.D. in the work which
16 they have done and also in our approach to the Senate Bill,
17 939. We have deferred to the Department of State in its
18 position and in the statements which it has made.

19 But while our Department is a domestic agency by intent
20 and statute and action, as you well know, of environmental
21 necessity, if for no other reason, it finds itself working more
22 and more in international fields and dealing with problems which
23 extend beyond the continental United States and beyond the
24 boundaries of our country.

25 Within the statement, I have presented a brief description

1 of a large number of activities in which we are engaged. To
2 mention them and cite them very briefly, I believe we have
3 some 1,000 DHEW employees who work principally with inter-
4 national activities. These are not always the same 1,000,
5 because the professionals we have in our staffs are called on
6 on different occasions and at different times to go abroad and
7 to serve for international purposes.

8 One of those examples, of course, would be found in our
9 Organization for Pollution Control. Here suddenly we find
10 individuals who up to this time had not thought of themselves
11 as international servants or international individuals, now
12 finding that they must serve in the solution of some inter-
13 national problem.

14 To go further with that, we could count any number of
15 activities relating to smallpox, malaria and other diseases
16 and quarantine problems. We could go on, if we will, to the
17 John Foggerty International Center for Advanced Study in the
18 Health Sciences. This is the part of the National Institute
19 of Health.

20 We could go on to the Institute of International Studies
21 and to various other activities which have developed within the
22 vast network of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

23 It is with those that I am primarily concerned at this
24 time within my administrative capacity and as a Special
25 Assistant for International Affairs to Secretary Finch. I

1 endeavor to try to find some sense and meaning in the melange
2 which we have before us.

3 In considering Senate 939 of this present bill, I looked
4 at it from my personal position and also with some idea of
5 what the Department saw as its immediate concerns as it
6 endeavors to develop international competence which is
7 required by the new day, the new problems, which confront us.

8 I found at least a few points which I thought could be
9 mentioned advantageously here and would lead to the further
10 discussion and to the legislative consideration which is before
11 Senate Bill 939 and the purposes and objectives that Senator
12 Dominick has.

13 First of all, I would agree that our search for talent to
14 serve us abroad should be as far ranging and as deeply probing
15 as we can make it. I am of the opinion that present recruit-
16 ment procedures are adequate to immediate needs, but that there
17 is a need for a broader talent base, there is need for more
18 capabilities, and that some of these can be tapped through the
19 bill.

20 A second point which I would like to make is that the
21 bill has one of its broad purposes the utilization of the
22 considerable capabilities that have developed during the past
23 decade or so in our colleges and universities throughout the
24 country.

25 I would emphasize that a good deal of private and public

1 capital has been poured into these developments and the
2 institutionalization of these approaches.

3 This is both in private foundation money, individual
4 monies and it has been public funds which have come through
5 the National Defense Education Act, through Title 6 of that
6 Act, through various other efforts for which the U.S. Government
7 has been most supportive.

8 With these two basic points in mind, it seems to me that
9 the thrust of what I would present today is the idea that we
10 do have a considerable new capability in materials, in manpower,
11 in training and that the real problem which would confront a
12 professional department such as that of Health, Education and
13 Welfare is to combine these capabilities with the professional
14 competencies to enable us to do as successful a job as we
15 confront and as we anticipate in the future.

16 This is the summary of my statement.

17 Senator Pell. I appreciate your statement.

18 I think while the Congress is never governed by the views
19 of the Executive Branch, it does appreciate knowing them. I
20 am wondering, do you believe the national interest would be
21 better served by the passage of this bill or better served by
22 its defeat?

23 Dr. Grassmuck. I am not in a position to make a statement
24 on that at this time, Senator. It is my view that the broad
25 purposes of the bills should be very definitely and thoroughly

1 considered and the ideas which have generated it, the needs
2 which have generated it, should result in the development of
3 further legislation which would be satisfactory to the Executive
4 and Legislative Branches and to the meeting of our needs.

5 Senator Pell. This is a little aggravating frankly,
6 because I understand you don't want to take the position, and
7 you are instructed not to take a position, but are you either
8 for it, you oppose it, or do you support it or decline to
9 take a position? Don't give me sort of a cloud of words.

10 Dr. Grassmuck. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I recognize your
11 needs.

12 Senator Pell. I just want to know your position. The
13 State Department is very forthright and said they opposed it,
14 period. We know where they stand. Where do you stand, or do
15 you just say you have no position?

16 Dr. Grassmuck. I am in a position to defer to the
17 Department of State and this we have done. I am also in a
18 position to say that we have very good interest in the broad
19 purposes of the bill, and then a further point which should
20 be made and this should be considered here certainly, is that
21 there are aspects of the bill which I am sure will need further
22 legislative consideration before the bill is ultimately passed.

23 Senator Pell. Many of us face decisions. To have this or
24 that in would be a great idea, or it is a good idea and we
25 support it on balance. On balance, do you oppose it, support

1 it or decline to take a position? You can do any one of the
2 three, but just please do one of them.

3 Dr. Grassmuck. What you have given me, Mr. Chairman, is
4 a set of three positions. I believe there are more possibilities
5 than those, if I may say so. There are definite nuances here
6 and there are positions which we want.

7 I should say that you know the Administration's position
8 at present is in opposition to this bill. I should say as well
9 that the bill represents recognizing a felt need in the con-
10 sideration of ways in which we can meet the need. In that case,
11 I am certainly in favor of its thorough consideration and its
12 analysis in the legislative channels which you know well and
13 which certainly, Mr. Chairman, have their advantages as they
14 refine legislative measures.

15 To go further than that, I would say there are certain
16 specific parts of the bill which raise questions and which I
17 would be happy to discuss and talk with you about, if you would
18 care.

19 Senator Pell. I will accept this cloud of words. Really,
20 most witnesses had come up from the Administration are a little
21 more forthrightly to say the ideas are good and they support
22 the concept or they say the ideas are good but they believe it
23 is not in shape to be passed, but they have a view. I really
24 don't recall a witness who is being quite as fussy in this
25 regard and unwilling to take a position on balance as you.

1 Thank you.

2 Senator Dominick. Dr. Grassmuck, I have read over your
3 statement. I appreciate the support which you give the idea
4 anyhow.

5 Senator Pell. He may well support the bill. He just
6 won't say it.

7 Senator Dominick. If I understand your position, the
8 position that you are in, that you have to defer to the State
9 Department and you are not going to go beyond that, other than
10 the fact that you say the bill does have some good objectives.
11 Am I correct in that interpretation?

12 Dr. Grassmuck. Yes, sir, I believe you are, Senator.

13 Senator Dominick. I thank you for the kind words. It
14 is helpful to get at least some people who think it is a good
15 idea. I hope you keep after it.

16 I do have some questions. Do you have a tabulation which
17 could identify by the number and location, location by country
18 of the civilian employees of your Department who are abroad
19 whether they are U.S. citizens or otherwise?

20 Dr. Grassmuck. No, sir, at present we don't have a
21 complete tabulation for the full Department. We have statistics
22 at present for the Public Health Service, and I should be
23 happy to submit those, if you care to have them. We are
24 endeavoring to get a complete tabulation of all of the people
25 who are in the service of HEW who are abroad and I shall submit

1 that for the record.

2 Senator Dominick. That would be very helpful. I would
3 appreciate it. If you could give us the Public Health Service
4 as graphically as possible and get the others in as soon as
5 you can, it would be helpful.

6 (The information to be furnished follows:)

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Senator Dominick. As to your personnel who are serving
2 overseas, how many of them receive in-service training after
3 employment?

4 Dr. Grassmuck. You are speaking, sir, of in-service
5 training which would enable them to work overseas specifically?

6 Senator Dominick. Yes, or to upgrade their expertise
7 overseas, wherever they may be stationed. In other words,
8 some of them I would presume go to the Foreign Service
9 Institute. I am just presuming this. I would also believe
10 that probably some of them are sent to colleges or universities
11 and some of them may get some in-service training.

12 Maybe if you could give us some breakdown of how many of
13 these are, what the proportion is amongst those three examples.

14 Dr. Grassmuck. Yes, sir. I would need of course to get
15 the whole population overseas before I am able to determine the
16 amount of in-service training which they would get and would
17 be happy to try to submit that to you as well.

18 (The information to be furnished follows:)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I could say, though, on the basis of present experience
2 that those of our personnel who go to colleges and universities
3 are detailed for that purpose, usually don't go there to learn
4 about international activities. They go for professional
5 advancement and development. I have not heard of one who went
6 to a college or university for international training.

7 Senator Dominick. In other words, they go there to
8 upgrade their own area of expertise?

9 Dr. Grassmuck. Yes, sir. That has been the emphasis
10 entirely in the Department. This is the scale upon which
11 their promotions are based. It is to that end that they
12 address themselves.

13 Senator Dominick. The broad scope of knowledge of our
14 relationship with other nations is not really touched on on
15 that unless it happens to be their area of expertise?

16 Dr. Grassmuck. Yes, sir, unless it happens to be their
17 area of expertise or unless they are willing to do a good bit
18 of at-home reading on their own.

19 Senator Dominick. Setting aside the number of citizens
20 that you have located overseas, I would also presume that you
21 have domestic employees, people who live within this country,
22 who are either administering programs through contacts with
23 other countries or readily are in contact with citizens of
24 other countries. Is that correct?

25 Dr. Grassmuck. Yes, sir. We have a large number of

1 employees who are engaged in this type of activity, and who
2 have face-to-face conversation contact and other forms of
3 contact with individuals who are overseas, some of them in
4 relatively high level positions in corresponding ministries
5 of health or education.

6 We do have a number of professionals.

7 Senator Dominick. So you would supply the information that
8 we asked Mr. Mace to get. He could get it from your Department
9 and from you fairly easily then?

10 Dr. Grassmuck. Yes, sir, we would be the ones responsible
11 to for giving him that information.

12 Senator Dominick. Do you have any rough estimate at
13 this time as to how many of these people might be involved?

14 Dr. Grassmuck. It would be over 800 who are at work of
15 this kind. We now have such a variety of institutes and
16 organizations which are at work here that this has become a
17 very large group for us.

18 If I could emphasize very briefly here the function of
19 this organization or of these people, it is not only that of
20 diplomatic contacts certainly, but of the development of
21 additional sources of knowledge and information about such
22 activities as health delivery services, or of better ways of
23 controlling communicable diseases or of the discussion and
24 handling of population situations.

25 In all of these instances we come into the need for a very

1 neat arrangement of diplomatic capabilities along with pro-
2 fessional competence. Out of this, in turn, we hope there is
3 a considerable input into the Department of Health, Education
4 and WElfare on the way in which things are being done.

5 Senator Dominick. How often do the overseas employees
6 return to the United States, either on sustained or on a
7 temporary basis? In other words, what is the term of service
8 overseas, and then how long do they come back here and then do
9 they go overseas again?

10 Dr. Grassmuck. A two-year assignment overseas is usually
11 considered a long assignment and about maximum for our people.
12 There are occasions when they are detailed to other activities
13 on participating agency service agreements. This would mean
14 that some of our professionals may be working with A.I.D. for
15 a period of three years or so. But this would be about the
16 maximum.

17 Senator Dominick. Would they then come back and stay here
18 for a while? Or do they come back and stay here permanently?

19 Dr. Grassmuck. We would have hope that they generally
20 come back and stay a while and I think that is the regular
21 practice for most of these people. In a number of other cases,
22 however, there are individuals who are assigned for particular
23 tasks for functions overseas who may find that this is their
24 one assignment overseas and who then return to the regular
25 order of business in the Department.

1 Senator Dominick. Do you give any training to the
2 families of these employees who go overseas?

3 Dr. Grassmuck. No, sir, we don't.

4 Senator Dominick. No language training?

5 Dr. Grassmuck. We have endeavored to make some provisions
6 for that, as we can, but it is usually quite limited.

7 Senator Dominick. With respect to your allocation of
8 people to the Foreign Service Institute for further training,
9 do the families of these people also get training through the
10 Foreign Service Institute?

11 Dr. Grassmuck. To my knowledge, they are given an
12 opportunity to have that training. However, again, I must
13 confess ignorance on much of this matter.

14 The people who go to the Foreign Service Institute are
15 relatively few from our Department, and so far as I know, they
16 have not had a major impact upon the total of our international
17 activities.

18 Senator Pell. I would like to interpolate here. I think
19 the Foreign Service Institute is capable of handling a number.
20 If I am wrong, I wish you could correct me, and the decisions
21 as to whether the families receive language and protocol
22 training rests entirely with the people. Am I correct or
23 wrong, Mr. Mace?

24 Mr. Mace. We do not normally give language training to
25 dependents. There are some who get language training at their

1 posts of assignments on what they call a post language training
2 program.

3 Senator Pell. What do you mean post language?

4 Mr. Mace. For example, in Paris, there could be a
5 language training program in French to which dependents might
6 be accommodated.

7 Senator Pell. But only when they are on post?

8 Mr. Mace. Yes.

9 Senator Pell. I thought that dependents could get
10 language training here at the Foreign Service Institute?

11 Mr. Mace. No.

12 Senator Pell. I stand corrected.

13 Senator Dominick. Do you recruit on campus for your
14 personnel at all, Mr. Grassmuck?

15 Dr. Grassmuck. Yes, certainly we have regular examinations
16 for positions in the Department of Health, Education and
17 Welfare. These examinations, however, are not directed toward
18 international competence. For the most part, they are efforts
19 to recruit professionals in the fields of medicine and public
20 health, engineering, and the other professions.

21 Senator Dominick. Where does your recruiting go on? Is
22 it limited geographically or is it nationwide?

23 Dr. Grassmuck. The recruiting is nationwide. We make
24 every effort to recruit through the regional offices and to
25 distribute the various pieces of information throughout the

1 university world and nationwide.

2 Senator Dominick. Are you concentrating on any particular
3 type of college or university largely at the medical schools or
4 the public health service schools, or are they general in
5 nature?

6 Dr. Grassmuck. To my knowledge, the recruitment that is
7 done needs to be done within those areas in which professional
8 competence can be found, which means that we would send of
9 course circulars and interviewers to the medical schools.

10 Insofar as possible, however, it has been Departmental
11 policy to try to make as wide an effort to recruit as is
12 possible. This would mean a nationwide distribution of our
13 information.

14 Senator Dominick. I thank you.

15 Senator Pell. Thank you very much.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Pell. Our next witness is Dr. Francis Wilcox,
2 Dean, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies,
3 representing the American Council on Education. He is an old
4 friend, not only personally but an alumnus of the Hill who has
5 gone on to more glorious circumstances.

6 STATEMENT OF FRANCIS WILCOX, DEAN,
7 JOHNS HOPKINS SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
8 REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

9 Mr. Wilcox. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members
10 of the committee.

11 My name is Francis Wilcox, formerly Assistant Secretary of
12 State, and presently Dean of the Johns Hopkins School of
13 Advanced International Studies.

14 Prior to that I had the privilege of serving as Chief of
15 Staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for a 10-
16 year period. During my days as teacher, as Government official
17 and as dean, I have had a great interest in the problem to
18 which you address yourselves this morning.

19 For a number of years I have served as a member of the
20 American Council on Education Commission on International
21 Education and it is in that capacity that I appear before you
22 today to support generally S. 939, a bill which you are now
23 considering.

24 The American Council on Education represents 1343 colleges
25 and universities, 213 non-profit education organizations and

1 83 affiliates. Its membership includes 53 percent of all
2 regionally accredited universities, 83 percent of all regionally
3 accredited four-year colleges and 42 percent of all regionally
4 accredited junior colleges. And providing a line of communica-
5 tion between higher education and the Federal Government on
6 major programs and policies of mutual concern is one of the
7 principal functions of the American Council.

8 I will not burden you, Mr. Chairman, with reading the
9 manuscript which I have submitted to the staff of the
10 committee.

11 Senator Pell. It will be inserted in the record as if
12 read.

13 (The statement referred to follows:)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Mr. Wilcox. I would like to point out two or three
2 things in connection with my testimony. The American Council
3 has long been concerned that the public officers in our
4 Government, in the foreign field, be given the best preparation
5 and training that the country could muster and personally, I
6 have had a feeling that, for example, the Armed Services have
7 offered many more opportunities in the educational field than
8 have been available to the Department of State and to some of
9 the civilian agencies of our Government.

10 The Council has consistently sought to develop ways in
11 which the rich resources of the American colleges and
12 universities could best be turned to that purpose. We are
13 already on record, therefore, many times as believing that the
14 Federal Government should develop and support more purposeful
15 programs to that end.

16 We see this legislation a recognition of an appropriate
17 public responsibility. That responsibility is to underwrite
18 expertise across a broad range of official U.S. offices repre-
19 sentation, in keeping with the demands of our complex and
20 troubled times if I can coin a new phrase.

21 We believe that the basic scholarship principal involved
22 in this bill is sound and we think that the long-term purposes
23 of the bill would be distinctly furthered if some portion of
24 the monies authorized could be invested directly in strengthening
25 the institutional resources to be used.

1 The Government is bound to look more and more to the
2 universities for a variety of services. I may say that the
3 financial strains on institutions of higher learning are
4 becoming increasingly acute.

5 We have been looking at our own budget for the next year,
6 for example, and I view with some apprehension the years that
7 lie ahead because of the increased cost of operations and
8 the tendency on the part of the Government to support higher
9 education a little bit less perhaps than it has in the past.

10 There is, therefore, I think a mutuality of interest,
11 but there is also a limit to the financial resources institu-
12 tions can devote to new programs, no matter how eager they may
13 be to undertake them.

14 For this reason, we urge that the pattern established by
15 the National Defense Fellowships, the National Science
16 Foundation Fellowships, the National Institute of Health
17 Fellowships and other programs be followed here and that a cost
18 of education allowance be paid to the institution for each
19 scholar or fellow being trained under the proposed program.

20 In summary, Mr. Chairman, the Council would like to
21 register its support for the purposes of this proposal,
22 particularly as they relate to educational support for foreign
23 affairs. We hope favorable consideration can be given to
24 strengthening it in the particulars we have suggested in this
25 memorandum.

1 Just one final thought: the American Council recognizes
2 that the proposed legislation addresses important aspects of
3 the administration of foreign affairs beyond the educational,
4 notably the selection process, the manpower needs, and the over-
5 all management of the foreign service and its institutions.

6 The foregoing comments relate primarily to the educational
7 concern of the proposal which we believe to be so very
8 important. In general we are quite pleased with your proposal
9 that our Government should utilize existing institutions of
10 higher learning for the purpose of preparing American citizens
11 for careers in the foreign service and in the international
12 service generally.

13 Certainly, in my judgment, this is a much more effective
14 way of meeting our country's needs in this critical field than
15 the creation of a special foreign service academy as some
16 people have suggested.

17 I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

18 Senator Pell. Thank you.

19 I was just curious, speaking as a representative of the
20 colleges, do you see any problem here with students receiving
21 support from the Federal Government, exercising any constriction
22 upon the courses they attend or the professors? Do you see any
23 constrictions arising from the universities from this kind of
24 support for these cadets, these students?

25 Mr. Wilcox. No, I don't think so. The fact is, the

1 universities need financial support and will continue to need
2 more financial support, I think, from the Federal Government.

3 There is now available money for the proper training and
4 education of people for the Armed Services, for the Air Force,
5 the Navy and the Army, and I think appropriate resources should
6 be made available to the universities for the proper training
7 and education of people in this important field of our national
8 life.

9 Senator Pell. If, God forbid, that one of these young
10 men were involved in one of these campus demonstrations, as
11 you know there is a great deal of movement, would there be any
12 difficulty in his particular position over those from the
13 regular NDEA scholarship?

14 Mr. Wilcox. I don't think they should be treated any
15 differently. Problems could arise, of course. But these are
16 minor compared to the great advantages that might stem from
17 financial assistance of this kind for these purposes. I don't
18 believe that there are any problems that cannot be resolved
19 reasonably on the campus today, if both sides take a fairly
20 reasonable attitude. I think in most cases now the students of
21 our universities and colleges feel that they are acquiring a
22 channel of communication to the administration.

23 Therefore, the need for violence and for demonstrations
24 is becoming less great from their point of view, if they have
25 access to the faculty and to the dean and to the president and

1 so on so they can present their demands in an orderly way.
2 Then the need for these other methods I think abate somewhat.
3 Senator Pell. I must say I agree with you. Things seem
4 to be moving in the correct direction. I hope we will study
5 this matter further as we conduct our higher education hearing
6 which will be starting next month.

7 Senator Dominick?

8 Senator Dominick. I really appreciate your support for
9 the ideas behind this bill. I very much appreciate it and the
10 broad background and the position you have.

11 It is my understanding that at the present time you are
12 one member of the group that is looking into the area of
13 expertise for the new head of the Foreign Service Institute,
14 is that correct?

15 Mr. Wilcox. That is correct.

16 Senator Dominick. I, as I say, have had the privilege of
17 going through this on several occasions, just visiting. I have
18 not actually been a student there, although I would liked to
19 have been on several occasions.

20 I see you have some doubt about the wisdom of transferring
21 this from the State Department over to this new board.

22 Mr. Wilcox. I thought I should put that caveat in my
23 statement, because I did not want to appear before the committee
24 having been asked by the Undersecretary to serve on the
25 committee to which you referred. I did not want any conflict of

1 interest to present itself. Therefore, I thought I should
2 excuse myself from taking a position on this point.

3 What I would feel personally, if I had an opportunity to
4 study the matter carefully, and if I were not involved in
5 the deliberations of this other committee, I would not want
6 to say at the moment.

7 Senator Dominick. I think this particular provision of
8 the bill, which I asked the staff to include, certainly does
9 raise some questions, because it seems to me that maybe these
10 two programs could go on conjunctively and be of assistance in
11 the overall ability to educate people and not necessarily have
12 one or the other.

13 This is why I put it in and raised the question. We can
14 decide what to do with it later, as to whether or not to leave
15 it under the State Department.

16 Mr. Wilcox. In a sense, I think that is a secondary
17 question, if I may say so, in terms of the total impact of
18 the bill.

19 Senator Dominick. That is the way I felt about it. But I
20 did think the question ought to be raised.

21 Mr. Wilcox. I do believe, as the Chairman pointed out,
22 that the Foreign Service Institute is doing an increasingly
23 good job and I feel that with the leadership which it may
24 have -- this is said without any reflection on previous leader-
25 ship, which has been very good -- that it can expand its

1 activities and develop in further constructive ways.

2 Senator Dominick. I gather from your testimony that you
3 feel that this approach, namely, to utilize the existence of
4 the expertise of the existing universities is better than the
5 Foreign Service?

6 Mr. Wilcox. Yes, Senator. I think it would be unfortunate
7 if another institution was created for the purpose of training
8 and educating foreign service officers when there are so many
9 universities in various parts of our country that have developed
10 very good programs in this field and which can offer a wide
11 variety of professors and talent and programs for this purpose.

12 I have always felt it was a very good thing to have our
13 foreign service officers recruited from various parts of the
14 country and from various institutions.

15 Senator Dominick. Thank you. That is what I have been
16 urging for a long time.

17 Mr. Wilcox, the bill presently contains four year under-
18 graduate scholarships, as well as graduate scholarships. Some
19 people in our conversations with them have suggested that the
20 undergraduate scholarship be for only two years, presumably the
21 last two years of their college career.

22 Would you agree with this, or do you think a four year
23 scholarship is better?

24 Mr. Wilcox. I think there are sound arguments in favor of
25 the two year program, particularly if you are thinking in terms

1 of reducing the total amount involved under the bill. Often,
2 students do not know when they begin their undergraduate work
3 what kind of career they would find most suitable for their
4 talents and interest. It is only when they get to the junior
5 and senior years that they become convinced that they are
6 really interested in international relations or in economics
7 or in some other profession.

8 We have had a program at Hopkins which we call the ABMA
9 program, designed to give young people coming to the university
10 for the first time an opportunity to obtain a master's degree
11 in a five year period, whereas, normally, we have a six year
12 period for the master's degree.

13 This program has worked quite well, but we find that
14 generally speaking, many students are not quite ready to make
15 up their minds by the time they complete their high school
16 work, whether they want to go into the foreign service or
17 follow some other pursuit.

18 So I think it would not be at all harmful to the purpose of
19 this bill if you would take the last two years rather than
20 all four years. I may say I approve of the ideals of putting
21 a little more emphasis upon graduate work rather than under-
22 graduate work. My experience in the Department of State
23 suggests that it is very good from some students to have some
24 graduate work if they are going into the foreign service.

25 For this reason, in this year's bill, we have increased the

1 number of graduates as compared to undergraduates. That I think
2 is a good amendment.

3 Senator Dominick. If you had your "choosies" do you
4 think it would be better to restrict the undergraduates to
5 the last two years and use the funds which would be otherwise
6 involved for the first two years for giving training to non-
7 citizen employees who are working overseas?

8 Mr. Wilcox. I would want to think about that. Generally,
9 I think it might be a very useful thing to do.

10 Senator Dominick. It could become complicated if we had
11 to bring them back to the universities here, as I see it.

12 Mr. Wilcox. It could be there. But certainly there are
13 arguments in favor of providing in-service training for not
14 only our citizens in the Foreign Service but those who are
15 performing useful functions for us abroad even though they are
16 not American citizens.

17 Senator Dominick. Under the present terms of the bill, if
18 a Corps member satisfactorily completes a year of specialized
19 study in a foreign country, after his graduate degree, he is
20 to be appointed as a foreign service officer without the
21 examination now required by law.

22 Do you have any views on the merits of this particular
23 provision?

24 Mr. Wilcox. I think it would be all right, if the standards
25 providing for the selection of officers in the first instance

1 are high enough, sufficiently high and the results of the
2 examinations indicate that the individuals concerned have
3 indeed achieved a fairly high level.

4 I would think this would be an appropriate way to handle
5 the matter. In other words, the selection in the first
6 instance, if that is good enough, your suggestion I think would
7 follow.

8 Senator Dominick. Mr. Wilcox, are there any other
9 countries that have programs similar to that envisaged in this
10 bill? Specifically, I was wondering whether the school in
11 France -- it seems to me that is more like a foreign service
12 academy.

13 Mr. Wilcox. Yes, I don't know enough Senator about the
14 precise relationships between the Government and the individual
15 students involved at these institutions to be able to answer
16 your question accurately. Of course, as you know, in most of
17 these countries, the Government takes care of all the expenses
18 relating to the university and the work of the students.

19 In Europe, tuition in Switzerland is practically nothing
20 at the University of Geneva. I think this is true all over
21 the continent so that the Government does foot the bill in
22 almost all cases.

23 This is what you are attempting to do in this bill.
24 In addition to that, of course, you are attempting to devise a
25 selection process which will be suitable and workable. I am

1 afraid I don't know enough about the details to answer your
2 question accurately.

3 Senator Dominick. Do you have any ideas or thoughts on
4 the name that we have created here, the Foreign Service Corps?
5 It seems to be somewhat misleading in the broad scope of the
6 activities that we are looking at. Sometimes, if you get a
7 good program and put a wrong name on it, you can't get it
8 passed. If you get a bad program and put a nice pink label on
9 it all tied up with a ribbon, you can.

10 Mr. Wilcox. I can't offhand think of another title that
11 would be more appropriate. But it is quite possible that one
12 could be devised. Some people may object to the Corps in the
13 sense that it suggest a kind of esprit that is involved let us
14 say in the Naval Academy or the military academy and perhaps
15 this isn't the kind of thing they would want to do for the
16 Foreign Service.

17 I don't have any objection myself to the title.

18 Senator Dominick. In like terms, we make several
19 references in the bill to the field of foreign relations. Do
20 you think we should try to define it or use another term?

21 Mr. Wilcox. No, Senator. I think if you attempt to
22 define it, you get into difficulty because in a definition,
23 if you leave out some fields or areas of study, then presumably
24 they would not be subject to the terms of the bill. I think it
25 would be preferable to leave it broad and permit the board to

1 engage in any definitions that might be necessary.

2 Senator Dominick. I really appreciate it, Mr. Wilcox.

3 It has been very helpful.

4 Mr. Wilcox. Thank you very much.

5 Senator Pell. Thank you very much, indeed, Dr. Wilcox.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Pell. Our final witness this morning is Professor
2 Raymond Tanter, Department of Political Science, University of
3 Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

4 I see you have a prepared statement here. You may proceed
5 as you wish.

6 STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR RAYMOND TANTER,
7 DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
8 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
9 ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

10 Mr. Tanter. Thank you, Senator. I plan to comment on the
11 prepared statement.

12 Senator Pell. It will be received in the record as if
13 read.

14 (The statement referred to follows:)

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Mr. Tanter. I am doing research at the University of
2 Michigan devoted to bringing to bear systematic methods to the
3 study of foreign affairs. Specifically, I am interested in
4 the application of computer technology to foreign affairs
5 analysis.

6 I favor this bill to provide for a Foreign Service Corps.
7 The Corps makes use of existing academic institutions, hopefully
8 drawing upon some of the educational innovations at these
9 institutions. This is the main point in my testimony.

10 I list three educational innovations that the Corps might
11 benefit from: program budgeting, the development of formal
12 and empirical theory and the use of computers in foreign affairs
13 analysis.

14 I use the words "program budgeting" somewhat loosely to
15 identify a whole host of methods that sometimes go under the
16 label of systems analysis program budgeting and what have you.
17 But it is the art of relating costs to programs and, as you
18 know, it made quite an impact in the problem of the Department
19 of Defense. Program budgeting has not had a corresponding
20 impact in the Department of State, however.

21 Some people argue that moving from Defense to State is
22 a very difficult task. It is not simply going across a river
23 that you are moving from a field of relative simplicity,
24 weapons cost and weapons management in relation to programs, to
25 a field which is much more complicated, the field of diplomacy.

1 Well, I argue that the highly trained systems analysts
2 who work at places like the Rand Corporation had to deal with
3 quite virgin territory when they first began to apply systems
4 analysis to the programming of weapons systems and that there
5 should have been an effort trying to apply program budgeting
6 and systems analysis in the field of diplomacy, and that, had
7 such preliminary effort been done at places like the Rand
8 Corporation, then we would have had some pay-off with respect
9 to applying or more pay-off with respect to applying these
10 more systematic methods to foreign affairs analysis.

11 There have been several studies of the quality of Foreign
12 Service Officers. I will cite a few of these in my testimony.
13 John Harr, for example, shows that some 65 percent of Foreign
14 Service Officers have master's degrees having majored in
15 history, political science, or international relations. These
16 are fields that provide the substance of diplomacy but generally
17 do not provide for modern management tools, for the handling
18 of diplomacy.

19 Another study shows that Foreign Service Officers generally
20 favor more intuitive over more systematic approaches. A study
21 by Regis Walther concludes that the junior FSO is highly
22 verbal and strongly prefers impressionistic as opposed to
23 systematic methods of information handling.

24 One of the reasons for this, I suspect, is because the
25 hierarchy in the foreign service community has by and large

1 rewarded intuitive over more systematic approaches. I quote
2 former Secretary of State Dean Rusk in this respect, and let
3 me read that quote.

4 "What we need to know is everything there is. What we
5 need to know cannot be accomplished in a man's lifetime. But
6 we need to delve deeply into many fields in order that we as
7 policy-makers can make policy with understanding."

8 This is not the way businesses tend to operate. It is
9 not the way that many of the more innovative public policy
10 institutes at universities are training people. But it does
11 seem to typify the dominant culture in the foreign affairs
12 community.

13 This is to be a generalist, to try to know everything
14 possible, and I argue to be in a very sad position for
15 managing information as a result, because you are completely
16 swamped with information if you have no theory which will
17 guide the processing of information and if you don't have the
18 techniques for the analysis of such information.

19 One can look at the Country Analysis and Strategy Paper
20 that the single intergovernmental group does. This is the group
21 that was formed among the various agencies that handle foreign
22 affairs. These Country Analysis and Strategy Papers are
23 extremely weak in theory. They are extremely weak in hard
24 analysis. They try to describe much too much about a country
25 and relate this to the countries or to the United States interest

1 in these countries.

2 I would suggest that if the staff of the senior inter-
3 governmental group were more adequately prepared in formal
4 and empirical theory, in the study of world politics, that
5 staff would be more likely to turn out Country Analysis and
6 Strategy Papers which are much more fruitful.

7 Several universities, such as Berkley, Harvard, Michigan
8 and Princeton have tried to develop integrated programs that
9 draw upon formal theory, program budgeting, and the use of
10 computers in foreign affairs.

11 I would hope that if there is a Foreign Service Corps,
12 that the bulk of the training would be in these more advanced
13 techniques. I don't think we have a problem with the provision
14 of the more traditional knowledge in foreign affairs. The
15 Foreign Service Officer tends to get this without even wondering
16 about the other methods.

17 The Foreign Service Institute has developed a quarterly
18 course in computers in foreign affairs. I have lectured at
19 this course for over two years. And some of the mid-career
20 officers have adopted some of the new methods that they have
21 learned in these courses.

22 But this course at the Foreign Service Institute which I
23 consider to be an excellent one only touches a small proportion
24 of those available as foreign service officers and it does not
25 have any impact at all on the new foreign service officer.

1 Senator Dominick. If I might interrupt there, I might
2 say that your system would have been extremely helpful in
3 avoiding the expenditure of funds on the airport at
4 Afghanistan where no airplanes fly into it. All they have to
5 do is put some things in the computer to figure out there
6 wasn't going to be any air travel there as soon as jets came
7 into existence.

8 I sympathize with your efforts.

9 Mr. Tanter. Thank you, sir, for that systems analysis of
10 airport traffic.

11 My suggestions are quite in accord with the American
12 Foreign Service Association recommendations. You notice that
13 the leaders of this association, Mr. Walker and Mr. Bray are
14 trying to push for an expanded competence in foreign affairs
15 management and analysis within the State Department.

16 Similarly, within the Bureau of Intelligence and Research,
17 the Director of External Research has written several papers
18 on an expanded competence for foreign affairs analysis.

19 I suggest that this expanded competence will not have much
20 of an impact unless the initial Foreign Service Officer
21 training is changed.

22 My last point is that there has been a sharp decrease in
23 the support for National Defense Education Act Fellowships.
24 In the present budget of the Administration, I gather there is
25 even a more severe decline in the number of fellowships that are

1 anticipated in the program. This will, I think, hamper the
2 recruitment of Foreign Service Officers, irrespective of
3 this methodological orientation that I am suggesting.

4 With the Ford Foundation, with Carnegie, with Rockefeller
5 moving more into domestic areas, I suggest that the loss of
6 NDEA support will be felt very acutely in the recruitment of
7 foreign affairs personnel.

8 In addition, the failure of Congress to appropriate funds
9 for the International Education Act, I think, spells doom
10 to many universities that emphasize world politics in their
11 curricular. In particular, I feel this is extremely bad for
12 the more innovative type curricular.

13 The universities that have invested large sums of money
14 in trying these new methods out in reference to foreign affairs
15 might begin to decrease their expenditure in this.

16 I might add parenthetically that the Agency for Inter-
17 national Development has a great need for people trained in
18 program evaluation. They have what is called a "product
19 appraisal report" which is a report that tries to evaluate a
20 technical assistance project in a less developed country.
21 There are over 3,000 or so technical assistance projects that
22 AID manages abroad.

23 Most of the personnel are adequate in their technical areas
24 like health, nutrition and education. But they are not very
25 adequate when it comes down to evaluating the impact that, say,

1 a credit cooperative in West Pakistan has on the development of
2 West Paskistan. They are not adequate in general in evaluating
3 the big picture, in using the systematic methods for program
4 evaluation.

5 I could give similar examples with A.I.D., Peace Corps
6 and the other foreign affairs agencies.

7 Thank you.

8 Senator Pell. Thank you very much.

9 Your thought in making better systems approach is one that
10 the State Department particularly, an old line agency, could
11 make good use of. On the other hand, you start out being a
12 little critical of the intuition. I think so much of the
13 dealings we have in the face-to-face basis depend a bit on
14 intuition. It is very hard to conduct a negotiation on a
15 systems approach. I think when it comes to what you suggest,
16 in making operating decisions, there is a great deal of room
17 for additional use of this methodology.

18 Senator Dominick?

19 Senator Dominick. I gather in some areas, Mr. Tanker, what
20 you are saying is that the scholarships provided under this
21 bill would give the opportunity for people trained in new
22 methods to enter into foreign service which would be a shot in
23 the arm for our whole foreign service. It is certainly the way
24 I feel and is the reason behind the bill, to be really frank
25 with you.

1 I felt for a long period of time that we kind of repeat
2 the mistakes we have made in the past instead of trying to find
3 new methods by which we can separate out the mistakes that we
4 have made from the progress we have made in other areas, and
5 that the university approach by this method would be far more
6 palatable in the development of foreign policy for the future.
7 So I am really appreciative of your testimony.

8 Not all universities are using your approach, obviously.
9 There are a great number of universities who have regular
10 courses in international relations, foreign affairs, economics,
11 agriculture and so on, but it would seem to me that the broad
12 scope of this bill, or the opportunity of getting new inputs
13 from each of the university type programs would be helpful in
14 developing programs for the future.

15 Do you feel that way? Am I correct in setting forth your
16 position?

17 Mr. Tanter. Yes, Senator.

18 Senator Dominick. We talk about, and I asked Mr. Wilcox
19 this, the question of a field of foreign relations in terms of
20 quotations in the bill. Do you think we ought to define that
21 term or should we leave it broad, as Mr. Wilcox suggested?

22 Mr. Tanter. I think I agree with Dean Wilcox, that you
23 should leave the field of foreign affairs as a broad,
24 undefined kind of domain. I think military security affairs,
25 for example, constitute a great bulk of foreign affairs, and

1 that one of the problems is that the State Department officer
2 is not as adequately trained as his military counterpart in
3 these more systematic methods.

4 And that the military have in effect taken more and more
5 advantage of their systematic training in encroaching more and
6 more into the domain of foreign affairs analysis. I could
7 cite many examples of this with respect to Vietnam data
8 analysis. But I won't.

9 Senator Dominick. We can't afford to get into a debate on
10 that. We would never finish the hearings.

11 Mr. Tanter. do you feel that the phrase is broad enough
12 to encompass specific training in agriculture or in communica-
13 tions or in the Federal Aviation Administration where they are
14 going to be working overseas?

15 Mr. Tanter. I think that students who are going to land
16 grant institutions such as Michigan State, who are going into
17 agriculture abroad, would have considerable opportunities under
18 the Foreign Service Corps legislation.

19 Senator Dominick. You don't think that the term "field
20 of foreign relations" would be so oriented towards foreign
21 policy that it would exclude those people who certainly it was
22 not intended to do so?

23 Mr. Tanter. I think the concept of foreign relations has
24 a higher probability of excluding agriculture and environmental
25 pollution for example than the field of foreign affairs.

1 Senator Dominick. So if we were going to change the word,
2 you would change the word "relations" to "affairs"?

3 Mr. Tanter. Yes.

4 Senator Dominick. Someone once asked what the difference
5 was and why the House called it foreign affairs and the SENate
6 called it foreign relations. They said it is because of the
7 age of the respective people. People in the House can have
8 affairs, but in the Senate, they can only have relations.

9 The input of a Foreign Service Institute, once again: have
10 you had a chance to analyze the training programs and the efforts
11 that they put forth in the way of training to determine whether
12 or not your new type of ideas are built in with it?

13 Mr. Tanter. I have only looked at the computer in the
14 foreign affairs course at the Foreign Service Institute
15 extensively. I have sent several students to the language
16 training programs and they have given me feedback on them and
17 the programs are quite good, it seems.

18 It seems to me that the type of methodology that I advocate
19 is quite compatible with the thrust in the computer in foreign
20 affairs course that the Foreign Affairs Institute has inaugu-
21 rated, but that course does not have a high prestige within
22 the Department of State.

23 Senator Dominick. Do you give us from your experience any
24 estimate of how much we should allow for each scholarship in
25 a Corps as it is proposed under this? This includes tuition,

1 room, board, et cetera.

2 Mr. Tanter. At the graduate level, I suspect something
3 like a \$5,000 a year annual figure would be necessary. That
4 might not be the figure that you select. But I think that is
5 about what is necessary. I am not sure of the undergraduate
6 level.

7 Senator Dominick. What do you think about changing this
8 to the junior and senior years for undergraduates as opposed
9 to a four year basis?

10 Mr. Tanter. At first thought, I agreed with Dean Wilcox's
11 position that the students in the first and second years might
12 not be adequately prepared to know what they wanted to do and
13 it is best maybe to make them in the third and fourth years.

14 But I suspect that many students from the poorer communities
15 might not get past the second year, if such change were made
16 in the legislation. It seems to me that one of the congressional
17 intents behind the Foreign Service Corps might be to spread out
18 the type of people that the Foreign Service attracts. I suspect
19 that the number of blacks, the number of Puerto Ricans and
20 Mexican-Americans would go down tremendously if you cut it off
21 at the second year.

22 Senator Dominick. Wouldn't it be possible that they would
23 have scholarships in other fields and then decide that this was
24 the field that they wanted to go into in the last two years?

25 Mr. Tanter. I doubt that, because the domestic scene is

1 growing very rapidly as an area of concentration within the
2 universities and especially among minority students. My wife
3 tells me that while I was studying the conflict in Latin
4 America that the City of Washington was burning down. We
5 could see the smoke. She asked me how relevant I felt my work
6 was. So I am under considerable pressure to switch into the
7 domestic area. Many of my colleagues are as well.

8 Senator Dominick. Thank you. I very much appreciate it.
9 You have been very helpful.

10 Senator Pell. Thank you very much indeed.

11 I think this concludes the morning list of witnesses.
12 The committee will recess until 2:30 this afternoon when
13 the first witness will be Dr. John Lumley.

14 (Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m. the subcommittee recessed, to
15 reconvene at 2 p.m. the same day.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

xxxxxx

pg 1 /
Reys flg
Milton

1-29-70
Senate Sub
on Education

xxxxxx

AFTER RECESS

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:30 p.m., Senator Pell, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.)

Senator Pell. The Subcommittee on Education will come to order.

I think there is a witness here substituting for Dr. Lumley in behalf of the National Education Association.

Will she come forward?

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY CONDON GEREAU, LEGISLATIVE CONSULTANT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, ON BEHALF OF DR. JOHN M. LUMLEY, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, LEGISLATION AND FEDERAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. Gereau. Thank you, Senator.

My name is Mary Condon Gereau, and I am substituting for Dr. Lumley, who was going to substitute for our president, George Fischer. We are now down to the third level.

Senator Pell. You have a very brief statement. If you want to read it, that will be fine. I don't think it will be hard to digest.

Mrs. Gereau. It may be simpler if I read it, Senator. I don't think I can brief it much more.

Senator Pell. I wish all statements were like this.

Mrs. Gereau. I have been doing this for some years.

I could say perhaps before we start that I think one reason I got this very pleasant duty is that I have been working with the overseas teachers who are members of our

2

1 association, and I have been in many foreign countries over
2 a period of time.

3 In fact, I lived abroad for two years, so I have met people
4 who worked for the Foreign Service and for the American
5 Government in other countries.

6 I think it was because of my personal interest in this
7 that this was given to me in the structure of our organization.

8 Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee:

9 The National Education Association supports S. 939 which
10 will establish the United States Foreign Service Corps.

11 We wish to commend the chief sponsor of this legislation
12 for his persistent concern for improving the educational
13 opportunity for young people who will be following careers in
14 foreign service for the Government of the United States.

15 S. 939 does not establish a foreign service academy but
16 rather, and wisely, provides for the use of existing programs
17 in the field of foreign relations offered in many institutions
18 of higher learning throughout the country.

19 The method of nominating and selecting persons to
20 participate in the Foreign Service Corps is fair as well as
21 competitive.

22 Perhaps the author might wish to include Guam along with
23 the Virgin Islands and the Canal Zone as an area from which
24 participants may be nominated.

25 It occurs to us that the national interest in the Pacific

3

1 area might benefit from such inclusion.

2 We also suggest that consideration be given to providing a
3 sum based on a per student cost to the institution for the
4 administrative costs involved in processing the students'
5 enrollments, and so forth.

6 A precedent for this is the G.I. bills. This fee, we
7 suggest, should be not in excess of 90 percent of the actual
8 cost of such service.

9 The Administrative Bond provided for in the bill will pay
10 the tuition and fees of the students selected. The \$15 million
11 authorized for the first year would support 5,000 students at
12 \$3,000 per student.

13 If all were single persons entitled to \$200 per month
14 stipend, this would leave only \$1,000 for tuition and fees
15 (beyond the \$2,000 subsistence for 10 months).

16 It is reasonable to assume, especially at the graduate
17 level, that a fair percentage of the students will be married
18 with dependents.

19 We believe, therefore, that the authorization figures
20 are not totally realistic. Tuition in institutions of higher
21 learning which have good foreign relations programs tends to
22 be high.

23 We believe this part of S. 939 should be carefully
24 reviewed. Either the number of students should be reduced, or
25 the authorization and appropriation substantially increased to

4 1 cover tuition and fees as well as subsistence. We prefer the
2 latter alternative.

3 Again, we commend the chief sponsor of S. 939 for his
4 genuine concern for improving the expertise of those who serve
5 the United States Government in the area of foreign relations.
6 The NEA Committee on International Relations joins in this
7 statement of support.

8 We as a profession are concerned that the image of the
9 "Ugly American" be abolished. While recognizing that those
10 presently serving the government in foreign assignments are
11 on the whole fine, dedicated people, we are also aware that
12 there is need for improvement here as in all phases of our
13 society.

14 We believe that the provision in S. 939 for supplementary
15 training in languages for the families of potential and
16 currently employed foreign service personnel is a particularly
17 fine feature of the bill.

18 The spouse and children of the Foreign Service employee
19 have much to offer -- and much to gain -- in the field of
20 international relations.

21 We urge the committee to approve S. 939, with consideration
22 to our comments in this testimony, and we will continue to give
23 this measure our active support.

24 Senator Pell. It is a statement of clear-cut support.
25 We appreciate knowing your views. I will turn any questions

5 1 over to Senator Dominick.

2 Senator Dominick. Thank you, Mrs. Gereau. Along with
3 the chairman, I appreciate your succinctness and certainly
4 appreciate your support. This will be very helpful.

5 I might say that the omission of Guam was just an over-
6 sight.

7 Mrs. Gereau. We always look out for Guam.

8 Senator Dominick. I think you are totally right. I know
9 what our involvement in Asian affairs is and it would make this
10 a very good move. I have no hesitation of going along with
11 that.

12 Your analysis of \$15 million for the authorization for
13 the first year is my next question.

14 My own thought in this was that in the first year, no
15 matter what fiscal year you put it in, you are probably going
16 to be partway through the school year. You will not really
17 be able to get this into operation until the second year, when
18 we have it increased to \$30 million.

19 The need for subsistence, as well as for tuition, seems
20 to me to be obvious. We will have to do something on that.
21 But it seemed to me, also, that we are not going to get the
22 total 5,000 students in the first year. You will have to set
23 up procedures. You will have to find out how the examination
24 systems will work.

25 There will be a lot of other things so that this will be

6 1 a gradual and growing procedure as I see it now.

2 I would like to ask you about the interest that NEA has
3 now in international relations. I think this is something
4 fairly new, isn't it?

5 Mrs. Gereau. No, sir.

6 Senator Dominick. In international education is what I
7 refer to.

8 Mrs. Gereau. It has gone on for some time but it has not,
9 shall we say, be the most advisable activity of our
10 organization. We have had a Committee on International
11 Relations for as long as I can remember.

12 I would say 15 years, at least. In fact, former
13 Commissioner of Education Frank Keppel, was at one time chair-
14 man of that committee.

15 Their concern is largely related to the improving of
16 teaching international understanding in the schools. They have
17 produced some rather widely used materials for teachers in
18 how to develop good understanding of international affairs and
19 international relations on the part, particularly, of
20 elementary and junior high school people.

21 We have not been, I would say, visibly active in the field
22 of higher education which is what, of course, your bill is
23 related to.

24 We, of course, are interested in the welfare of
25 the children of American citizens who are attending schools

7 1 abroad. There are 175,000 or something like that in the
2 Department of Defense schools, but there are another 35,000 to
3 40,000 in other schools around the world who are the children
4 of American personnel. We are interested in them.

5 Senator Dominick. What was your role overseas?

6 Mrs. Gereau. I lived in India for two years during the
7 war with the Red Cross, the CBI Theatre. We have discussed
8 that before.

9 Senator Dominick. Yes, we have.

10 Mrs. Gereau. We were China-Burma-India commandoes, I
11 guess.

12 The other activity was as a consultant to the House
13 Labor and Education Committee, the subcommittee that has toured
14 the overseas schools and helped with the Department of Defense
15 situation.

16 Senator Dominick. During that experience, did you have an
17 opportunity to personally observe whether or not the wives
18 and families of American citizens employed overseas had the
19 opportunity of learning about the culture and to get real
20 training in it, the language, anything of this kind?

21 Mrs. Gereau. Yes, sir. I would have to say I am speaking
22 now personally and not representing the policies of the NEA.

23 Yes, particularly the second time I went with the sub-
24 committee. I went to Latin America. There we did not have
25 much to do with the Department of Defense operations, because

8 1 they have very few installations as such.

2 So we worked almost exclusively with those schools which
3 are called American International Schools, and to which the
4 children of American personnel stationed in various branches
5 of the government are concerned.

6 It is my own personal opinion that many of the people
7 who go abroad isolate themselves from the communities in which
8 they are serving. They have their own little ghetto, almost.

9 Senator Dominick. I have just an observation to give
10 you from the wife of a Foreign Service Officer who was
11 stationed in Greece, and was told, apparently, at least by
12 implication, that the wives of people in the embassy there,
13 and they had a great number of them, were not expected and
14 were not encouraged in any way whatsoever to mingle with people
15 who were in Athens at that time, or in the neighboring areas,
16 and were discouraged from learning Greek.

17 This was most annoying to a number of them who had friends
18 and who would like to participate in another community other
19 than this American ghetto, as you put it.

20 I think the opportunity afforded by this bill would
21 provide some training of this kind and would be helpful. That
22 is why I wanted to get your viewpoint.

23 Mrs. Gereau. Sir, I personally think it would be, too.
24 As we said in the statement, a particularly good feature of
25 the bill is the involvement of the spouse and the children of

9 1 the American who is going into Foreign Service, in learning
2 languages and becoming more aware of the role they can play
3 to really conduct the most informal and, therefore, perhaps,
4 the best or good international relations.

5 Senator Dominick. I sincerely appreciate your statement.

6 Senator Pell. Thank you very much.

7 The chair will have to recess the committee. There is a
8 roll call vote going on.

xxx/xxx

9 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10 1 Senator Pell. The subcommittee will come to order.

2 Our next witness is our good and faithful Dr. Knoll, Dean
3 of Faculty, The Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies, Monterey
4 California.

XXXXX 5 STATEMENT OF DR. SAMSON B. KNOLL, DEAN OF
6 FACULTY, THE MONTEREY INSTITUTION OF
FOREIGN STUDIES, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

7 Mr. Knoll. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 I understand that my prepared statement will be part of
9 the record, and I will ad lib, not only on what I have prepared,
10 but since, fortunately, I did not start the proceedings thi
11 morning, as I almost did by default, I might comment on some
12 of the earlier comments that were given.

13 Senator Pell. That will be helpful. Your statement
14 will be inserted into the record at this point.

15 (The document referred to follows:)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11 1 Mr. Knoll. It has been suggested to me that I say
2 perhaps a little bit more by way of introduction about the
3 institute I represent. I do so very gladly. Part of it is
4 in the record.

5 May I just state here that we are a fairly new,
6 independent and small college. We were founded in 1955. We
7 were accredited in 1961. I joined the institute in 1962. We
8 are devoted to the broadest range of foreign studies, and we
9 are, therefore, very much interested in the bill that was
10 introduced by Senator Dominick.

11 As a matter of fact, my personal interest in the bill
12 goes back some two years when Senator Murphy, of my home
13 State, drew my attention to it, and a year and a half ago I
14 had an occasion to discuss it here in Washington with Senator
15 Dominick.

16 My own interest in foreign affairs goes back a long time.
17 It goes back to my beginnings as a student. I am a historian
18 by profession. It became much more pronounced in the 1930's,
19 when, in 1935, I came to Senator Dominick's home State and
20 started my teaching career at the University of Colorado for
21 two years, and one year at the State College at Greeley.

22 Since I came from Europe, and everybody who comes from
23 Europe presumably is an expert in foreign affairs, I was at the
24 tender age of 23 put on the speech circuit in more towns in
25 Colorado than I can remember.

12 1 I remember the agony that I had in trying to awaken in
2 the people to whom I spoke a real concern for foreign affairs.
3 This, by the way, not only was true of the adults whom I
4 talked to; it was unfortunately also true of many of the
5 students.

6 It was very difficult to convince, in those years,
7 students or teachers, or the public at large, of the necessity
8 for doing something in our foreign relations in order to
9 prevent another World War from breaking out.

10 It took another war and the aftermath to change the public
11 at large, and I think to change the attitude of the students.

12 While I regret many of the excesses that have occurred
13 on the campuses of our country, I think there is one good
14 thing: At least, they are no longer interested in swallowing
15 goldfish or in pantie raids as they were in the days of our
16 youth.

17 I might parenthetically add here something concerning the
18 remark you, Mr. Chairman, made about what do we do with the
19 demonstrators who enroll in the Foreign Service Corps, or
20 Foreign Service Corps students who become demonstrators. I
21 don't think they will.

22 One of the major concerns that these students have these
23 days, it seems to me, is the question of peace. A Foreign
24 Service Corps, almost by definition, would be a very potent
25 force for peace.

13 1 I think this would obviate, almost totally, any
2 possibility of this kind of demonstration. My own institute
3 is a case in point.

4 We have had none of that at all. Partly, of course, that
5 is due to the fact that we are and will remain small and,
6 therefore, we can always talk to our students.

7 I have a further series of events in my own career that
8 sharpened my interest in the foreign affairs of this country.
9 That is that during the war I was a member, and I might say
10 a rather proud member, of the Psychological Warfare Combat
11 Team of the 1st Army out in the field. The "Ugly American" did
12 not only exist in the Foreign Service -- and, incidentally,
13 my president, Ambassador Freeman, prefers the words "The
14 Obvious American", which I think is perhaps better, but there
15 certainly was the ugly psychological warrior, the person who
16 had no training, no empathy for the person whom he was
17 supposed to propagandize.

18 I think one of the essential links between psychological
19 warfare and diplomacy is, perhaps, the subtle form of
20 propaganda that both imply.

21 So for many reasons I am interested in the bill personally
22 and, of course, I am also interested in the bill as a
23 representative of my institute.

24 Our institutional interest in the Foreign Service was, of
25 course, greatly enhanced when Ambassador Freeman became our

14 1 president almost exactly a year ago. I am sure that you are
2 aware of his career. He is one of the country's leading
3 career diplomats who in the 30 years of his Foreign Service
4 saw service in China, in Europe, and in Latin America. He
5 was most recently Ambassador to Mexico.

6 Ambassador Freeman was our unanimous choice for president
7 three years ago and finally was able to join us a year ago.

8 While we have not officially, of course, as we could not,
9 established any direct ties to the Department of State, our
10 unofficial contacts have undoubtedly improved, and our
11 orientation is much more clearly oriented towards foreign
12 service than it has ever been before.

13 In fact, only for the last two years have we had
14 graduates who have applied for positions in the Foreign
15 Service, and those who have applied have been accepted. One
16 was just made a career Foreign Service officer and we are very
17 proud of that.

18 There are a number of reasons why Ambassador Freeman and
19 I personally, and as representatives of our institute, are
20 wholeheartedly in favor of the bill. Perhaps, number one
21 should be that it does create the awareness of which one of the
22 witnesses spoke this morning, that has helped to increase
23 the awareness of the public at large of the importance of the
24 Foreign Service to our country these days.

25 But there are two principal reasons why we are in favor

15

1 of the bill.

2 Number one, that it proposes to begin the special training
3 of future Foreign Service officers early. Again, by Foreign
4 Service, I would understand as broad a definition as possible.

5 We use the term "training for service abroad" in part
6 of our curriculum which might be a good way to encompass all
7 the various aspects of serving one's country or a private
8 corporation abroad.

9 The second principle in the bill which we support is
10 that in addition to beginning specialized training early, it
11 proposes to support the student who engages in financially.

12 Both, we feel, are really indispensable. There is no
13 reason why the Foreign Service, which has become more and more
14 important in our day, should be a stepchild behind other
15 professions, why the Armed Services should start the training
16 of their officer corps early in college, and as important a
17 branch as the Foreign Service in all its ramifications should
18 not.

19 With regard to the financial support, we feel that this
20 is of utmost importance, particularly in our days when the
21 cost of education, both to the student and to the institution
22 has skyrocketed and continues to skyrocket, and also in view
23 of the fact that it has been shown in the success of various
24 parts of the National Defense Education Act that financial
25 support for study is a very important incentive in attracting

16 1 students to areas of governmental and private activity
2 where manpower is needed.

3 We welcome very much the provision in the bill which
4 provides support for dependents. We think this is absolutely
5 crucial.

6 I could tell you any number of instances, both certainly
7 from events that Ambassador Freeman has told me, which prove
8 that the wife, incidentally, in our opinion also, the
9 children, of the American representative abroad, played a
10 vital role in the success of the mission, whatever that mission
11 may be.

12 Ambassador Freeman's wife, Mrs. Freeman, made it a point
13 wherever her husband went and she accompanied him, to learn
14 the language of the country and to engage in activities of
15 both social welfare and social welfare activities.

16 He has in his house in the Carmel Valley a screen with at
17 least 20, at least, testimonials, I would judge one-third of
18 them testimonials to Mrs. Freeman, by grateful Colombians
19 and Mexicans for what she has done.

20 With respect to the children, may I indulge in one story
21 told me by the Chief of Arthur Anderson Company, the famous
22 accounting firm.

23 They sent a young couple to Belgium, including the
24 children. The two children went to a Belgium high school.
25 After two years they graduated from that high school as the

17 1 best students in that school, competing with the Belgian
2 children.

3 You couldn't find better ambassadors for American
4 education and America than those two children.

5 So we are very strongly in support of the provision
6 which gives dependency allowance and which also makes it
7 possible for husbands and wives to take this training. In
8 fact, in our own training program which we have instituted
9 largely for the private sector, which we call "training for
10 service abroad," we recommend that wives and children take the
11 training along with the husbands.

12 So far we have had, I think, only three bachelors. We
13 are quite convinced that what this morning was characterized
14 as post-training is not sufficient.

15 The third reason why we are wholeheartedly in favor of
16 the law is that it provides that this training be given at
17 colleges and universities throughout the country.

18 Ambassador Freeman believes that this is absolutely vital.
19 He is very much in favor of that section of the bill which
20 disclaims the establishment of a foreign service academy,
21 though he, himself, has taken many courses in the Foreign
22 Service Institute.

23 He is very much aware of the work that it can do and of
24 its accomplishments, but he is also very much aware that the
25 training that is given at schools throughout the country, where

18 1 you have a constnat influx of new ideas and a fresh approach
2 to the training in foreign relations, or the training of a
3 future Foreign Service officer, that that eventually will
4 benefit the Foreign Service.

5 Senator Dominick. May I interrupt at that point?

6 Mr. Knoll. Yes.

7 Senator Dominick. Do I understand from this that you
8 think that the Foreign Service Institute should probably stay
9 as it now is formulated and not be put under the same Board of
10 Regents as this United States Foreign Service Corps?

11 Mr. Knoll. I think that would be Ambassador Freeman's
12 opinion. He believes very much that one of the important
13 functions that the Foreign Service Institute can render is, of
14 course, to provide in-service training, since it is doubtful,
15 at least for a while, that all of the future Foreign Service
16 officers will have gone through the Foreign Service Corps.
17 Also, there is the problem of training for reassignments.

18 In other words, he has taken reassignment training when
19 he was transferred, let us say, from China to another country.
20 He would be in favor of leaving that intact and having the
21 Foreign Service Corps be the basic professional training.

22 Incidentally, on the name of the Corps, if it is true
23 that some people will object to it because "Corps" gives the
24 idea of rigidity, it could be Foreign Service Fellows, Foreign
25 Service Fellowships, or something along that line, which might

19 1 avpid that impression.

2 Senator Dominick. Foreign Service talent search.

3 Mr. Knoll. That brings up a point to which I will allude
4 later.

5 Anyhow, he would be very much in disfavor of creating
6 one Foreign Service Academy with institutionalized vested
7 interested. Related to this, is, in my opinion, the need to
8 give the greatest possible latitude to the curricula provided
9 through the participating colleges and universities.

10 I think this is an absolute must if the freshness of
11 approaches be a constant factor in such training, and that,
12 therefore, the Board of Trustees that is to be
13 established should provide guidelines, and no definite
14 curriculum.

15 The Board of Trustees should encourage experimentation
16 in teaching as long as the basis guidelines are observed.

17 I would think that the Board of Trustees would give very
18 serious consideration to appointing either to the Board or to
19 appointing as a committee to work out the guidelines for the
20 several curricula career diplomats of proven worth and
21 experience, because they are the ones who have been out in
22 the field, who can do a great deal of work to assist the
23 colleges in working out acceptable curricula.

24 The Department of State has, of course, the diplomatic
25 residents, and perhaps on a systematic basis that could be

20 1 incorporated into the proposed Foreign Service Corps.

2 A point that we stress, that we hope Senator
3 Dominick as the author of the bill, and this committee, will
4 consider is institutional support.

5 Obviously, I am speaking here, perhaps, with a certain
6 amount of self-interest, but hopefully of enlightened self-
7 interest.

8 Unless some institutional support is provided, as is
9 done under some titles of the National Defense Education Act,
10 the small, independent college, such as ours, would almost
11 be put out of competition.

12 We feel that the small, independent college has played
13 and will continue to play an absolute vital role in training
14 this country's leaders.

15 We simply will not grow, I think, beyond 500 or 700
16 students. We don't believe that true excellence and training
17 can be provided at today's modern universities.

18 Since, as was pointed out this morning, foundations
19 are turning more and more to the domestic scene and, therefore,
20 these programs must, some way or another, find the necessary
21 funds, I think Federal institutional support will be very
22 vital.

23 The future of the Foreign Service Institute has already
24 been discussed, so I will not go into that.

25 May I address myself to a point raised this morning,

21 1 perhaps anticipating questions that Senator Dominick might
2 have. That is the question: Should the financial assistance
3 be provided for four or two years?

4 I should suggest the greatest possible flexibility, not
5 only in view of what was said this morning, that providing
6 support only for two years might, of course, disadvantage the
7 disadvantaged more than they are already, but also that while
8 it is true that so many of our students really do not know
9 before their junior year where they want to go, there are
10 significant exceptions.

11 I also believe that the success of the advanced placement
12 program in our high schools has given a number of students now
13 a better professional outlook at the end of their high school
14 career than 30 years ago or 35 years ago when I started
15 teaching in this country.

16 So flexibility, I think, would be what we would advocate
17 in the question of financing for two or four years.

18 Senator Dominick. In other words, to leave this open so
19 that if a youngster decided that this was his future, whether
20 it be in agriculture, economics or in foreign service as such,
21 he would have the opportunity, then, of getting a scholarship
22 to go all the way through.

23 If he didn't have that, he might shift into another field
24 where he had no economic support.

25 Mr. Knoll. That is correct.

22 1 Senator Dominick. I think that is a good thought.

2 Mr. Knoll. While I therefore agree, at least in part,
3 with a previous witness, Dr. Tanter, I am not sure that I
4 agree with the suggestion he made this morning that the bulk
5 of the training be in the more advanced techniques.

6 I like to think that we who are historians like to think
7 that by definition we are humanists. Some people think we are
8 social scientists, but I don't.

9 I do have a certain amount of fear of the machine, but
10 this is not decisive. I think what the chairman brought out
11 this morning is much more important. There are many situations
12 in the face-to-face contact where the computer is not going to
13 be any help.

14 You will have to decide them on the basis of intuition.
15 You have to decide them on the basis of having a certain
16 amount of flexibility in your movements, and on that none of
17 the advanced techniques can help us.

18 Whether or not there is a way of training somebody's
19 intuition I will have to leave to the psychologist.

20 I have two more points. One is that in selecting the
21 educators that are to be appointed to the Board of Trustees,
22 we should hope that there will be a great latitude. We hope
23 that they will not be chosen solely on the basis of having
24 the most publications or being the most famous names. We hope
25 that considerable attention will be given to those who are

23

1 teachers and can impart this important knowledge to their
2 students best.

3 The second point was the one I already raised about
4 demonstrations. Therefore, this could be the end of my formal
5 testimony and I will be ready to answer any questions you
6 might have.

7 Senator Pell. One concern that I have is the thought
8 that the Foreign Service should be drawn from as broad a
9 section as possible.

10 I would be worried that there would be sort of elite
11 corps within those working for the government abroad made up
12 of those who, as in the Navy, if you went to Annapolis you
13 wear a ring, and somehow or another you notice the Admirals
14 wear that ring.

15 I would be worried that somehow or another that those who
16 got to the top of the Foreign Service ladder after a period
17 of time will have to have started off in this Corps, which would
18 mean we would lose a good many people.

19 What would be your view about that?

20 Mr. Knoll. Our view would be that the fact that the
21 service corps is supposed to be trained at colleges throughout
22 the country would obviate that at least to the greatest
23 extent possible.

24 This is, of course, one of the objections that Ambassador
25 Freeman has to a Foreign Service Academy.

24 1 There is the question of the selection process, perhaps,
2 which would be very much more important in this respect. We
3 should hope that the sole criterion for selection is
4 aptitude, and not only the passing of certain examinations,
5 but some form of test which can show whether the candidate has
6 the means of acquiring that kind of knowledge that will enable
7 him to move, and that kind of empathy that can enable him to
8 move, among other people. This can be done.

9 We are doing it in a very minor way in our program where
10 Ambassador Freeman, in his experience, writes confidential
11 reports to the employer, where he states whether or not he
12 thinks the candidate is capable of doing a certain thing.

13 So I think that would be the best safeguard against
14 creating any leak.

15 Senator Pell. Thank you.

16 Senator Dominick.

17 Senator Dominick. I was concerned for many years about
18 the fact that we were creating any leak with the emphasis
19 on many of the Ivy League schools on people coming into the
20 Foreign Service Corps.

21 I can say this because I am an Ivy League graduate and
22 so is the chairman.

23 I did some analysis of this over a period of time and
24 it looks now as if there is a broader representation than
25 there used to be.

25 1 It would seem to me that drawing these people from
2 diverse universities with different methods of training and
3 throughout the Nation would further dilute any influence of
4 that kind which might be present at the present time.

5 Would you think this is true?

6 Mr. Knoll. Yes, I certainly would.

7 By the way, I fully agree with you. I not only started
8 out in Colorado, but I volunteered for the mountain troops,
9 although I was pulled out early then and went overseas.

10 I remember my first encounter with one of my fellow
11 recruits who was from Yale, and who was very surprised when
12 I, with my background -- I had started at the University of
13 Berlin, had gone to the Sorbonne, and then had gone to
14 England -- when I told him that there wasn't anything that
15 Yale hadn't taught me that I couldn't get at Colorado
16 University.

17 Personally, I don't believe that the elites in terms of
18 learning really exist. The illusion may exist.

19 Secondly, the greatest diversity would make that
20 impossible.

21 Senator Dominick. Have the government agencies that
22 now exist here been contracting with your institution for
23 training purposes at all?

24 Mr. Knoll. Not on any formal basis yet, although we have
25 had one inquiry from the Department of Commerce.

26 1 As I indicated, the Foreign Service has taken our
2 graduates. Apparently they do very well. But no formal
3 contracts exist of that nature yet, no.

4 Senator Dominick. What do you think in your judgment
5 is the relative balance insofar as need is concerned between
6 scholarship aid for this purpose and perhaps direct assistance
7 to colleges and universities conducting a program?

8 Mr. Knoll. It would be hard for me to give you any exact
9 proportion there. I think both of them are necessary. Both
10 should probably be based on need.

11 In other words, on the availability of resources to the
12 college. And on the need of the students for the fellowship.
13 I don't know whether it is possible to draft a law which
14 provides that anybody whose parents are above a certain income
15 level may be accepted into the Corps but would have to pay
16 his own tuition.

17 I don't know whether that would be possible. But the
18 element of need should, I think, be given great consideration.
19 I wouldn't be able to give any proportion, however.

20 Senator Dominick. One of your basic principles in
21 support of this bill is the fact that you think the people
22 may take pre-employment experience and training as opposed
23 to post-employment experience and training?

24 Mr. Knoll. Decidedly, not only in my own view but in
25 the view of Ambassador Freeman. I can tell you some hair-

27 1 raising stories which he has seen and which I saw in the war
2 in psychological warfare which would prove that.

3 Senator Dominick. Your acquaintance with Colorado is
4 certainly refreshing, as far as I am concerned. I have found
5 that people by and large in the State at this point are
6 extremely interested in foreign affairs and what is happening,
7 and the involvement of our State and our country.

8 I suppose it is because of the tremendous level of
9 experience that people got in World War II and in all the
10 crises we have had since then, Korea, Vietnam; people who
11 served over in Europe and so on.

12 So they are very aware at this point, I think, of the
13 problems we have. I congratulate you on your work in alerting
14 people, and I sincerely appreciate your support of the bill.

15 Mr. Knoll. Thank you, sir.

16 Senator Pell. Thank you very much.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28 1 Our next witness is Mr. Parker Hart.

xxxxxx

2 STATEMENT OF PARKER HART, PRESIDENT, MIDDLE
3 EAST INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D.C. (FORMER
DIRECTOR, FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE)

4 Senator Pell. I gather you have no prepared text, but
5 you wish to comment for a few moments on the bill proposed.

6 Mr. Hart. Yes, Senator. I have no prepared text because
7 there was not sufficient time.

8 Senator, I have looked at this bill once before, and
9 looking at it again in the last couple of days I find there
10 perhaps have been a few minor changes since the earlier text
11 which I saw sometime ago, but I am not 100 percent certain
12 since I am not able to make a direct comparison.

13 Now that I am out of the government, I do have some
14 ideas with respect to this bill. I would like to start by
15 saying that, in general, I support the bill, particular
16 because the Foreign Service does not have, at the present time,
17 a real constituency in the United States.

18 Foreign Service has come a long way in the 31-1/2 years
19 I spent in it from very small beginnings, but I do feel that it
20 needs to extend its roots more consciously into our
21 educational system than it has ever done in the past.

22 As I believe Senator Dominick just pointed out, research
23 has developed that it is no longer an Ivy League-fed institution.
24 That is certainly the case.

25 In fact, I believe the largest single State contributing

29 1 Foreign Service personnel is California, at least at the officer
2 level.

3 The fact is that it has been a question of taking what
4 we could get, that came before the Board of Examiners for many
5 years, without any particular, conscious effort that I am
6 aware of to feed back into our higher education institutions
7 criteria which they could use to educate candidates for the
8 Foreign Service.

9 We let the institutions judge for themselves whether they
10 were interested enough to develop courses which would prepare
11 people for foreign service, and in a few cases they have
12 made a conscious effort.

13 In many other cases, I think they have not.

14 This, of course, is part of the diversity of our higher
15 educational pattern. But at the same time, I am impressed by
16 the fact that in my time in service the demands upon an officer
17 have become far more variegated, involving much deeper
18 knowledge of specialized subjects than any of us who have
19 contemplated back in 1938 when I was commissioned.

20 Foreign Service officers, of course, one group that we
21 are speaking about here, and we are talking about the entire
22 foreign affairs community, as I understand from the bill,
23 whether you are serving in the USIA, whether you are serving
24 in AID, or other branches of the government as a civilian.

25 I should point out in this connection that we and the

30 1 military are very mixed up together. We are doing a lot of
2 training with them. They are attending some of our schools.
3 They attend the Foreign Service Institute.

4 They are enthusiastic members of the National Inter-
5 departmental Seminar, for example. A few of them are very
6 enthusiastic members of the Senior Seminar on Foreign Policy,
7 which is our highest course in the Foreign Service Institute.

8 We are mixing the services increasingly. We send our
9 people to their schools.

10 I have been down to Fort Bragg and helped them with some
11 of their considerations for a new school for MAG officers,
12 military attaches. I have spoken, since I retired from the
13 government, to a number of military schools where they are
14 actively engaged in trying to develop courses which train
15 the kind of military man who is able to go into more than a
16 attache jobs, but political, economic and analytical jobs,
17 and handle himself well alongside of highly trained civilians.

18 The foreign affairs community is a very large community
19 today as I look at it. This addresses itself, as I under-
20 stand it, to the civilian sector, and would constitute a course
21 which would really begin when a man is selected after
22 application to enter special study at government expense at
23 the time he leaves high school, and could continue through
24 college and into graduate work.

25 It also addresses itself to people already in the

31

1 government who want specialized training at government expense
2 for foreign affairs service in one of the many branches.

3 This, to me, is a very good aspect of the project,
4 because I do feel that it would generate a lot more talent,
5 consciously trained with a sense of obligation than we
6 probably ever had in the past.

7 We talk about elites. I wish to say I wish they were all
8 elites. That is to say those who serve in foreign affairs
9 should be in the elite of our population.

10 I can understand the reluctance to have an elite within
11 an elite, or people who think they are privileged characters.
12 We should draw from the very best we can get and train them
13 as well as we can.

14 The bill sets up one or two things I am not too clear
15 about. One is how it would function rather than what its
16 purposes are of the Board of Trustees.

17 The purpose of the Board of Trustees seems clear but I
18 am not quite certain myself how it would operate. It seems to
19 me it would require a fairly extensive staff, more than is
20 provided for in the bill at present.

21 To undertake to draft ground rules for education, for
22 examination processes, to handle the finances of so many
23 thousand applicants would seem to me require quite a lot of
24 help. Either you have to set that up and finance that in the
25 project, itself, or you have to draw on the resources of some

32 1 existing institution, especially equipped to do that.

2 Would you, for example, draw on the Foreign Service
3 Institute since it would be placed under the Board of Trustees
4 for purposes of planning and training?

5 Would you draw on the Board of Examiners of the Foreign
6 Service for purposes of screening?

7 These are comments of mine that are really in the nature
8 of questions because I am not certain, from reading the
9 bill, for example, whether the Board of Trustees would screen
10 all people through its mechanics who would come into foreign
11 affairs service, thereby limiting recruits into the service
12 to the people who had passed through its screening process or
13 through its educational process, or whether it would take them
14 from the country at large and screen them.

15 In other words, would people coming into foreign affairs
16 service be confined to those who had passed through this
17 process in the Corps, or would they come from everywhere?

18 Senator Dominick. I will say in connection with that, Mr.
19 Hart, that our analysis would indicate that there are far
20 more people coming into the Foreign Service in one way or
21 another than would be provided by this particular service
22 corps, at least for a long period of time, and eventually you
23 might get the bulk of replacements coming through this. But
24 that does not solve the question of staff and how we do the
25 screening and so on.

33

1 What would be your recommendation on that? Should we
2 work through the Foreign Service Institute or should we set
3 up a larger staff which would be independent of them?

4 Mr. Hart. I would think it would be to the advantage
5 of the Board to operate as much as possible with the
6 experienced personnel already on hand rather than have to go out
7 and really train perhaps for some time a brand-new staff.

8 For example, if the Foreign Service Institute is placed
9 under the Board of Trustees, it has within it a permanent
10 staff, but it also has in key positions people who are on
11 rotation from the Foreign Service who are assigned to direct
12 course. Some supplementation of their work could be
13 accomplished by bringing in a few more people for planning
14 purposes, conscious planning, to assist the Board of Trustees,
15 and then utilize the talents which you already have there,
16 which is pretty carefully selected.

17 We have some very good men in FSI.

18 Senator Dominick. I didn't mean to interrupt, but I
19 wanted to make that one point clear.

20 Mr. Hart. My other question was whether, after you
21 passed through the Corps training process, do you contemplate
22 a selection process for each government agency involved in
23 foreign affairs, or do you contemplate a standard examination
24 type of procedure, and would that examination be written and
25 oral; would it be a national examination, or would it be an

34 1 examination for each agency?

2 The requirements of each agency do have common
3 denominators. Certainly they have that. But they also have
4 very diverse requirements.

5 If you are talking about the agricultural service, the
6 interests of the Department of Commerce, of course, and AID,
7 or the Department of State, just to take a few, you can see
8 how diverse they are, or civilians in the Department of Defense
9 serving abroad.

10 From reading the bill, I am not sure that I see just where
11 this is provided for.

12 Senator Dominick. It was intended in the bill that the
13 Regents or the Board of Trustees would set up the requirements
14 on that, and presumably they would have examinations that
15 might differ in some respect for various agencies.

16 Mr. Hart. You would retain, as I understand it, the
17 Foreign Service Officer Corps.

18 Senator Dominick. Yes.

19 Mr. Hart. I think we have been moving for some years
20 into the situation in which ambassadors are drawn from all
21 agencies of the government, as well as traditionally, certain
22 number from private life.

23 That process could be sharpened up by a cohesive plan
24 for training and for guidance of the careers of people
25 interchangeably between different agencies of the government,

35

1 moving between AID, for example, and State.

2 It could be very good for a lot of Foreign Service
3 officers to have more of this type of experience, and a good
4 thing for the AID people also to have strictly State Department
5 type of assignments from time to time.

6 This you can accomplish best if you start early and train
7 people for flexible careers. I would hope that any proposal
8 of implementation of this bill would take that into account,
9 that you have to start with a young man. You can direct his
10 efforts toward a variety of different types of service in the
11 field of foreign affairs.

12 One question that I have is about the status of the
13 Foreign Service Institute being placed under the Board of
14 Trustees.

15 I would like to say that I feel that the Foreign Service
16 Institute has already become an interagency organization of
17 the government had has far gone beyond the position of a mere
18 training establishment for the Foreign Service which it was
19 set out to be by the bill in 1946.

20 About half of the work of the Institute is done for other
21 agencies of government. They pay a good share of the costs.
22 I believe that while all training for foreign affairs should
23 be under the general policy direction of the Secretary of
24 State, because I don't believe in the delusion of the
25 responsibilities of the Secretary of State in the field of

36 1 foreign affairs but I believe in strengthening them, this
2 particular organization, I think, has earned its way by
3 experience and by the dynamics of interagency activity in
4 becoming an organization which should be recognized for what
5 it is, an interagency training establishment. It is more
6 than just training. It is an interagency higher educational
7 establishment.

8 I would like to see it constituted as the National
9 Institute for Foreign Affairs and so-called. This, of course,
10 could still place it under a Board of Trustees of this kind.

11 There is no reason why it couldn't be.

12 I would hope that the Secretary's position on that
13 Board would be such that he would have the strongest voice in
14 its deliberations because it is his voice which is going to
15 count for the most in terms of training in general foreign
16 affairs service.

17 The other members of the Board will have great weight,
18 but his views should have the greatest weight.

19 These are my preliminary thoughts on the subject,
20 gentlemen, and I would be glad to try to answer any questions
21 if I can.

22 Senator Dominick. I have just a couple.

23 I gather from what you are saying that the Foreign Service
24 Institute, as such, could fit under this Board of Trustees, and
25 perhaps the Secretary of State designated as the directing head

37 1 of that National Affairs Institute?

2 Mr. Hart. Yes.

3 Senator Dominick. Alternatively, if we left it the way
4 it is now, which is under State, do you think that this would
5 solve that interaction problem?

6 In other words, do you think it ought to be moved into
7 the new Board of Trustees, or do you think it should be left
8 the way it is?

9 Mr. Hart. I do not feel that it should be left the way
10 it is. I feel that it has outgrown the position of being
11 just another part of the Department of State.

12 When you look on the schedule of various subdivisions
13 of the Department of State, you find this one pretty well down
14 toward the bottom of the listing, after the various operational
15 bureaus, and the position of director, itself, should be
16 upgraded in response to the interagency role it has long since
17 been playing.

18 I would give it a semi-autonomous status, if I had my
19 way, and raise it to the level of eminence of a national
20 institution for all foreign affairs studies and not just for
21 the training of foreign service personnel, at which other
22 agency people are admitted by negotiation, which has been the
23 case.

24 You negotiate so many slots, they pay their share, and we
25 take them as we can. I think it has suffered somewhat in

38 1 recent years from this position, and it has, in fact, earned
2 and merits a new look as a new body.

3 It is, in many ways, a trail-blazer for many of the
4 techniques of foreign affairs study. We use the universities,
5 as pointed out here, from the Foreign Service Institute, but we
6 could do a lot more than has been done to galvanize educational
7 institutions around the country to serve the purposes of
8 foreign affairs study, pre- and in-training study better than
9 they have done.

10 Senator Pell. The Chair must interpolate I haven't any
11 doubts about having serious studies done under direct
12 government auspices. This was the reason I originally
13 opposed the Foreign Service Academy.

14 I think what the institute does is direct its training
15 to carry out techniques in the field. But once you have
16 the government involved in serious studies, it is an
17 anomaly, because the government cannot really be objective.

18 For that reason, I would not want to see this become an
19 institution with all the professors receiving the green
20 government check.

21 The problem we have now is to get professors to stay more
22 than a year at the National War College. While I agree with
23 many of your ideas, I do not agree with your thought that the
24 institute should be made an institution of learning or study.

25 I am not sure that that should really be done under

39 1 government auspices, but should be done under private auspices.

2 Mr. Hart. I see your point, but the Foreign Service
3 Institute is that now. The Foreign Service Institute should
4 not be giving degrees, I agree. It could do as the War
5 Colleges do. When you are taking a course, you could
6 simultaneously arrange that curriculum so that you get a Master's
7 degree at the end of the year.

8 It is being done at the Industrial College. I happen to
9 be on the Board of Advisors of that. I think that there is
10 no substitute for the university system inherent in what I am
11 saying.

12 But we have a problem if we consider training in the
13 high sense that I am considering it. In using the word
14 "training," I don't mean just training in the techniques of how
15 to do a job.

16 We have, at the Foreign Service Institute, a 22-week
17 course in economics which is the equivalent of four years
18 of undergraduate economics, made possible simply by
19 accelerated training techniques, by the fact that the officers
20 who are taking it are taking nothing else but economics, and
21 they are mature.

22 They accomplish so much that they rate on a national
23 system of evaluation, which is done by Princeton University
24 quite objectively, 100 to 200 points higher than the national
25 average regularly.

40

1 The reason this was done was not because of anything
2 other than that you can't get this four years taken out of a
3 man's career to go to the university and take it at leisure.
4 You have to do it in a hurry.

5 Senator Pell. What I am driving at is your graduates
6 should not be advocating the various varieties of economics,
7 be it Adam Smith, be it King or Karl Marx. They are going
8 through a government school.

9 Mr. Hart. I think nonconformity is the rule at FSI.
10 For example, they have very hot debates over the type of
11 political science that is taught.

12 Senator Pell. I think there would be the devil to pay
13 if the taxpayers' money was used to graduate, say, Marx
14 economists, or even in these more advanced social days
15 Adam Smith.

16 Mr. Hart. I think anyone who is going to do his work
17 in economics is going to read them all.

18 But as far as the awarding of degrees is concerned, I
19 don't think that is the institute's job. The institute can
20 galvanize a lot of things in rather tradition-bound
21 university circles and they, in turn, can awaken the institute.

22 It is not a super university or university which I am
23 suggesting but, rather, a recognized national institute for
24 very definite but constantly changing purposes.

25 Senator Dominick. We have a National Institute of Mental

41 1 Health and a National Institute of a lot of other things, but
2 we don't have a National Institute of International Affairs.

3 I don't know whether this is the type of thing you are
4 thinking of. It would create the attention for the need of
5 expanding other institutions around the country for foreign
6 affairs.

7 This is the type of institution I am referring to as
8 opposed to a degree-granting institution. Is that what you
9 have in mind?

10 Mr. Hart. Yes.

11 Senator Dominick. The thing that I noticed from those
12 who say that the Foreign Service Institute can take care of
13 their problems at the moment is in the enrollments of the
14 Foreign Service Institute which you were kind enough to provide
15 for fiscal year 1968.

16 Fifty-seven percent of the enrollment involved language
17 training, and nine percent of the enrollment came from other
18 agencies besides State, AID, USIA and Defense.

19 So the other agencies, really, are a small portion of
20 the training that is being given. The training is good, but
21 there are only a small portion who are able to be the
22 recipients.

23 That is why it seemed to me that getting pre-employment
24 training as opposed to post-employment training might be very
25 fruitful.

42 1 I gather this is what you support.

2 Mr. Hart. Yes, Senator, and also there is a tremendous
3 proliferation of service schools studying in the field of
4 foreign affairs.

5 My impression is this is rather expensive in the long run,
6 although I can see the utility of it right now. They have
7 to move fast to get some of their men trained.

8 One of the things that I would hope a National Institute
9 of Foreign Affairs could do would be to arrest this great
10 proliferation to some degree and focus training more in one
11 place with maximum liaison with our universities.

12 In fact, I feel that the director himself should be
13 a man drawn from academic life, an eminent man from academic
14 life, not a person drawn out of the Foreign Service.

15 There are those who disagree with me on this, but this is
16 my strong feeling. A man drawn from high academic
17 experience, eminence, with a keen and high interest in foreign
18 affairs, can bring into the institute a relationship with
19 our universities and the creative currents that are moving
20 in them, in a way in which a Foreign Service officer on
21 routine assignment could never do, no matter how good he is.

22 I feel there should be a lot more than a War College
23 situation where you assign a lieutenant general to head up
24 the institute for a few years, two or three.

25 Senator Dominick. Thank you very much.

43

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Senator Pell. Thank you, Mr. Hart.

Mr. Hart. Thank you.

44 1 Senator Pell. The next witness will be Dr. George
2 Allen, President, Diplomatic and Consular Officers, Inc.,
3 Washington, D. C.

xxxxxx

4 STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE ALLEN, PRESIDENT,
5 DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS, INC.,
6 WASHINGTON, D. C. (FORMER DIRECTOR, FOREIGN
7 SERVICE INSTITUTE)

8 Mr. Allen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 I am George V. Allen, Foreign Service Officer, Retired.
10 My last assignment was as Director of the Foreign Service
11 Institute for three years, until last November.

12 Mr. Chairman, I appear in very strong support of this
13 bill. That doesn't mean to say that there aren't very honest
14 differences of views on a variety of points that are involved,
15 and in some cases I would have to say in all honesty that
16 I see pros and cons, and usually I come down on the pro side.

17 It might be 55 or 60 percent, but the election is
18 won by the pros, so far as I am concerned.

19 I would take the bill as it is, if I had to decide yes
20 or no.

21 There are certain parts of it that I might prefer, as all
22 of us would, to have our own ideas put into, but if I had the
23 choice of yes or no, I would just take the bill.

24 I must say I have given it a lot of thought.

25 Basically, the reason I welcomed the bill when Senator
Dominick first introduced it, was that we have seen so many
bills come before the Congress year after year for the

45 1 establishment of a Foreign Service Academy, and these bills
2 have a good deal of appeal.

3 A man can point out that we spend so many billions of
4 dollars to train people to fight wars. Why shouldn't the
5 government be in the training field to develop people who can
6 try to avoid wars and make peaceful adjustments between nations
7 in international affairs?

8 It makes a very strong appeal.

9 On the other hand, there are overriding objections, in
10 my opinion, very definitely, to a foreign affairs academy at
11 the undergraduate level.

12 First and foremost, they are that the Foreign Service is
13 rather inclined, and I speak here particularly of the career
14 Foreign Service of the State Department, but to some extent,
15 as other careers in foreign affairs get more and more
16 established, they take on more and more the aspects of a sort
17 of a closed corporation, a cliquish, clanish group, as they
18 are often accused, and with some justification, even though
19 they represent 500 different universities in their back-
20 ground.

21 Suppose you took all of these young men at the age of
22 18 and put them in the same institution, like West Point or
23 Annapolis, and trained them all four years in the same school
24 and then for whatever graduate work they were going to do,
25 and then went into the Foreign Service?

46 1 You would have a cliquish organization so thick that you
2 couldn't cut it with a knife. It would be very bad. It is
3 much better that the 3,500 officers in the Foreign Service
4 today do represent 500 American colleges and universities.

5 Incidentally, this subject came up this morning of
6 the Ivy League schools. You might be interested to know I saw
7 a study just yesterday. I happen at the moment to be associated
8 with George Washington University here in Washington. Of the
9 3,500 Foreign Service officers, and I am limiting that to
10 FSOs, some 700 have attended George Washington University,
11 more than any other university of the 500 that they represent.
12 About 740 or 750 attended George Washington University. About
13 630 attended Harvard, which comes next.

14 This obviously means that some of them attended evening
15 classes at George Washington to get their degrees, but it is
16 a curiosity.

17 The basic training of Foreign Service officers should be
18 through the established institutions of the United States.
19 I am convinced of that. There is too much tendency already
20 on the part of people to think that the Foreign
21 Service officers no longer represent the United States.
22 They live too long abroad or they have taken on this
23 coloration or that coloration.

24 It is protection for the Government of the United States,
25 the Congress, and the Foreign Service, itself, to have them

47 1 most broadly representative of the Nation rather than being
2 any restrictive group.

3 I am astonished at the number of bills that are still
4 introduced to create, I would say, a monster, in my opinion,
5 as I have described it. That is, an undergraduate academy
6 strictly for the Foreign Service.

7 You gentlemen undoubtedly know that the reason West Point
8 was established was as recommended by President George
9 Washington. He didn't see it actually formed while he was
10 President, but he pointed out that there were not private
11 institutions in the United States that specialized in training
12 to go into the U. S. Army. Such institutions didn't exist.

13 Consequently, if you were going to have one, the
14 government had to create one. That was the reason for the
15 creation of West Point and later Annapolis.

16 But such institutions do exist for the very adequate
17 training of Foreign Service people.

18 As I mentioned, 500 institutions are represented. So
19 there is not the same need or call for an academy, in my
20 opinion.

21 However, the other part of this appeal for training people
22 in Foreign Service is still absolutely valid that is advanced
23 on behalf of an academy.

24 That is that the Federal Government of the United States
25 should make more strenuous efforts to provide the best possible

48 1 personnel for the family of foreign affairs for the United
2 States in this period when our responsibilities are so
3 tremendous.

4 How can this be done? I am frank to say that I was at
5 my own wits end in trying to answer these, to write the State
6 Department comments on the bills that were sent up from the
7 Congress, which found their way to my desk often, to draft
8 for the Secretary of State his comments on this or that bill
9 because I did appreciate the basic point that the government
10 ought to be doing more.

11 That is why I welcome so much Senator Dominick's bill, and
12 I took the liberty myself, while I was in the government, of
13 telephoning him to say so. I found I was a little excessive
14 in that, that perhaps I should have gone through channels a
15 little more and found out what the official line was before I
16 expressed myself.

17 But I am glad that I am now in a position to express
18 myself very freely and openly in support of it.

19 Certain aspects of the measure, it seems to me, should be
20 commented upon.

21 Ambassador Hart was just speaking about the location of
22 the Foreign Service Institute. I am frankly of two minds on
23 that subject, trying to be as objective as I possibly can be.
24 There are some arguments for it and some against it, it seems
25 to me.

49 1 To begin with, the arguments against it. For one thing,
2 I must say in reading your bill, sir, Section 1211, headed
3 "Continuation of the Foreign Service Institute," merely changes
4 the direction of it from the Secretary of State to the Board.

5 It looks tome as if it is a little stuck in. I don't
6 quite follow the flow of the main purpose of the bill of
7 establishing the Foreign Service Corps. Perhaps you can
8 enlighten me.

9 But just as one person looking at it, it struck me when
10 I first read it as if you were saying suppose you were setting
11 up the ROTC for the Army, and you suddenly said that the
12 Naval War College in Newport, the National War College, and
13 so forth, shall come under the same Board that is going to
14 run the ROTC.

15 I would raise my eyebrows and say, "Why? How does that
16 follow? What connection is there?"

17 On the other hand, I agree fully with Ambassador Hart
18 in the idea that the Foreign Service Institute is a little
19 too closely tied to the Department of State. Other agencies
20 which use it feel a little as if they are going to a foreign
21 institution when they go from AID, USIA, Interior or Treasury
22 over to the State Department's training institute.

23 It would be better if we could get over that. This is
24 one way of doing it. Put it under a Board. Whether it be
25 the same Board that runs the Foreign Service Corps perhaps an

50 1 argument could be made. Avoid proliferation. And training
2 is a continuing process.

3 I haven't heard it brought out as clearly here and this
4 morning as it should be, but I think there are two separate
5 things. One is training to help people get into the foreign
6 affairs community, and the other is training after you get in.

7 The Foreign Service Institute, as you know, of course,
8 only trains people after they are in the field of foreign
9 affairs.

10 When I was director, I used to get letters. I got a
11 letter from a college or university fellow in Bombay, India,
12 wanting to know how he could enroll in the Foreign Service
13 Institute. You get them from a variety of people. Of course,
14 the answer is first you have to get a job in the U. S.
15 Government. It is in-service training. It doesn't help you
16 achieve a position in the government. It trains you after
17 you get in. And that is a very important role. It is a part
18 of continuing education, of course, that government, business
19 and other people have accepted today.

20 And from that point of view, it would be logical for
21 the same group which concerns itself with the pre-induction
22 training, I should think, and you can make a good case, to
23 continue its interest, although the subject matter is going to
24 perhaps change rather sharply from the pre-induction to the
25 post-induction period.

51

1 A good deal of the success of the Foreign Service
2 Institute is referred to as language training, like stenography,
3 or speed writing on a machine, or any other tool.

4 But, nevertheless, once a fellow is actually in the
5 service, he has so much more drive to learn Spanish if he has
6 been assigned to Venezuela. He goes for three months and he
7 learns more Spanish than you would learn in five years in
8 college, if you don't know where you are going.

9 If you know that three months from now your promotion is
10 going to depend on it, and I have to start using this right
11 in my job every day, a fellow really buckles down, and it is
12 amazing the amount of difference it makes.

13 It will astonish perhaps you gentlemen, and even
14 Senator Pell who knows the Foreign Service as well or better
15 than I, that in my opinion the U. S. Foreign Service today has
16 greater capability likewise particularly, in languages, in
17 depth, than any foreign service in the world.

18 When I say in depth, I mean we have, for example, perhaps
19 80 people who rank semi-professional -- we rank them speaking
20 and reading, one being the lowest, two, you negotiate; three,
21 is semi-professional; four, professional; and five, bilingual.

22 We have 80 people who can do S3, R3 in Russian; we have
23 100 perhaps in Chinese, 80 in Japanese, 45 in Arabic, 30 in
24 Turkish, 30 in Serbo-Croatian, and right on down the line.

25 I don't believe there is a single foreign service that has

52 1 the strength in depth that we do, particularly in esoteric
2 languages.

3 That is a surprising statement.

4 Senator Pell. Do you really believe that, that the
5 French Foreign Service, for example, would not have a better
6 language training program?

7 Mr. Allen. The French? No. I have to emphasize it
8 in depth, and this is the rest of the explanation.

9 You take a foreign service like the Swedish, and when a
10 fellow goes into the Swedish Foreign Service he has to know
11 English, French and German to start with. Or in the Greek
12 Foreign Service, he has to learn more languages.

13 But in our foreign service, for example, even there of
14 the 3,500 Foreign Service Officers we have, and this is not
15 particularly pertinent to this bill, perhaps, but it is an
16 interesting point, 1,100 of our officers qualify S3, R3, which
17 we require for a promotion in French, 1,000 in Spanish, 800
18 in German.

19 Those are the main world languages, and Portuguese and
20 Italian considered part of the same thing.

21 We divide the world into two parts, world language and
22 hard language. Everything that is not a world language is a
23 hard language.

24 Polish, Swahili, Hindustani, all of those, we train in
25 all of them, of course.

53 1 This is a technique, if you wish, or a technological part
2 of training, but it is a very, very significant one in the
3 formulations, I believe you will all agree.

4 A question was raised this morning as to whether this
5 ought to be in the last two years of college or all four. My
6 own thought is that this could well be left up to the Board and
7 worked out by trial and error.

8 I would be inclined to emphasize the last two years, but
9 the gentleman from Michigan had a good point, that if you
10 restrict it by law to two years you might eliminate some
11 minority groups that otherwise you couldn't reach.

12 I would give myself permission for the Board, but allow
13 the Board to be the judge on that.

14 Senator Dominick. It seems to me there is another point
15 on that. That is that a good number of the high school kids
16 who are bright, smart and driving ahead look forward to
17 colleges and their area of interest but they have some eye on
18 the economic pocketbook as well.

19 You can get scholarships for engineering purposes, you
20 can get them for a variety of other things. You can't get
21 them for foreign relations as far as I know practically any-
22 where in the country.

23 Therefore, if you did this, it might steer them or enable
24 them to go into an area of interest which otherwise they wouldn't
25 think of.

54 1 Mr. Allen. I think that is a very, very good point.
2 There has become such competition for scholars, fortunately,
3 I think, as there is competition for football players. Schools
4 offer scholarships to attract the most capable students
5 intellectually, law schools, medical schools, and offer
6 bigger scholarships.

7 It is an excellent point, it seems to me, to offer
8 scholarships in foreign affairs to attract the more able
9 and capable groups.

10 The one point in your bill, sir, that probably will cause
11 more discussion and maybe more opposition in the State
12 Department than any other single one is the provision that
13 if a person goes through the prescribed course of study and
14 the Board finds that he is adequate, he shall be commissioned
15 a Foreign Service Officer of the United States without other
16 examination.

17 Personally, I am frank to say I am not as shocked by
18 that provision as many of my colleagues in the Foreign
19 Service.

20 We have tried a lot of different ways to choose good
21 Foreign Service Officers. We have tried many different
22 schemes. But it all boils down to the fact that every time
23 an examination is given from 3,000 to 10,000 people take the
24 written part and then those that make a grade of 70 are invited
25 to come in and take the oral.

55 1 The best any examining procedure can devise is to have
2 them come for one hour before a board of five people. It is
3 true that you go into the background and you get letters of
4 recommendation from the professors. But you know what those
5 sort of things mean.

6 Your basic judgment as to whether this fellow is going
7 to be good in the conduct of the foreign relations of the
8 United States is based on a one-hour interview. Many foreign
9 services, and I believe the British at one time and maybe they
10 still do, take their candidates down on a month's sort of
11 off-site training at an institution of some sort, but then
12 they get at least a month to size them up.

13 Oftentimes, you can't tell until a fellow has actually
14 lived abroad whether he is allergic to foreigners or not, or to
15 being in a strange culture or strange environment.

16 So one hour of examination is not the answer to the best
17 way to choose good foreign service officers. Any other
18 system has problems with it, but if you have four years to
19 look at a fellow, plus a year of graduate work, it seems to
20 me you are probably more likely going to be able to determine
21 whether he is going to make a decent foreign service officer
22 than through a one-hour examination and whatever investigation
23 you make.

24 That is why I say I am rather more relaxed about your
25 provision. I am not entirely certain whether I wouldn't maybe

56 1 combine some kind of tool.

2 Senator Dominick. He has to have completed a year in
3 government service overseas, too, successfully.

4 Mr. Allen. Government service?

5 Senator Dominick. Yes. Specialized study, it is called.
6 So he has to have had that and successfully completed that as
7 well as his other work before that happens.

8 Mr. Allen. I think, sir, if I were a member of your
9 distinguished body and had to vote on this question, I would
10 say let us give it a chance, give it a try. There is no
11 perfect answer to these things. There are different ways of
12 going about it that you can experiment on.

13 I think, sir, that about terminates the thoughts that I
14 had on the bill.

15 The figures on page six of your document, Senator,
16 Dominick, are most impressive, that it costs \$40,000 to train
17 an officer for the Army, \$48,000 for the Navy, \$50,000 for
18 the Air Force, and so forth, yet, they turn out ROTC officers
19 for an average of \$7,500. That is very appealing.

20 That is another strong argument against establishing a
21 West Point for the Foreign Service.

22 Senator Dominick. It even convinced me.

23 Mr. Allen. On the other hand, people who are economically-
24 minded may very well say we are getting along pretty well now
25 and all these 500 institutions are doing good work in training

57

1 people, and we are not spending \$7,500 on them now.

2 On the other hand, it seems to me the answer to that
3 is that we ought to be. We are spending that on engineers,
4 doctors, lawyers, football players, and everything else,
5 except foreign affairs.

6 And this is the best way that I know of for the government
7 to do something about training people in foreign affairs. I
8 don't think of any better way.

9 There is no perfect solution to any of these things. We
10 are all human. We have to come up with the best ideas we can,
11 and these seem good to me.

12 I repeat that there is obviously a strong feeling in
13 the Congress and in the country that something ought to be
14 done on this. Otherwise, these bills wouldn't be coming in year
15 after year.

16 My good friend, Congressman Zablocki, puts in a bill
17 every year, and some of the features of his bill are not
18 entirely different from yours.

19 I should think you might be able to come together on the
20 matter.

21 That completes my remarks, sir.

22 Senator Pell. If there are no further questions, thank
23 you very much, Ambassador Allen.

24 Mr. Allen. Thank you.

25 Senator Dominick. I want to thank you for your testimony.

58 1 I think it has been very helpful. I think some of the comments
2 you made may be extremely important in trying to tone down
3 opposition which I know is present and which I am sure will be
4 more vocal as time goes by.

5 I really appreciate your remarks.

6 Mr. Allen. I hope you are successful.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

59 1 Senator Pell. The next witness is Mr. Ghosn J. Zogby,
2 Vice President, Foreign Service Research, Inc., Washington,
3 D. C.

XXXXXX

4 STATEMENT OF GHOSN J. ZOGBY, VICE PRESIDENT,
5 FOREIGN SERVICE RESEARCH, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C.

6 Mr. Zogby. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ghosn J. Zogby. I
7 am a retired Foreign Service Officer, now Vice President of
8 Foreign Service Research, Inc.

9 FSR is a survey and research group staffed exclusively
10 by former career officers of the United States Foreign
11 Service like myself.

12 We have all served over the years in various foreign
13 assignments for the United States and are familiar not only
14 with the types of personnel sent overseas by the United States
15 pursuant to various programs, but more importantly, the 'extent
16 to which the contacts between these individuals and those 'with
17 whom they have to deal abroad has affected the advancement of
18 the foreign policy of the United States.

19 Our own experiences have made us aware of a lack of under-
20 standing on the part of the American public of the specialized
21 knowledge of the technical complexities of diplomatic and
22 commercial transactions which is essential in order to achieve
23 the political and economic objectives of United States foreign
24 policy.

25 From this point of view, we at FSR have studied with

60

1 considerable interest the text of bill S. 939, which proposes
2 to establish and train a United States Foreign Service Corps.

3 We strongly endorse the principle expressed by this
4 legislation of recognizing the specialized character of the
5 work of the foreign service employees of the United States and
6 the desirability of extending the opportunity for acquiring
7 the necessary technical training to a larger group.

8 There are four points of the proposal which we support.
9 We view as essential to future foreign operations a broadening
10 of public and academic awareness of foreign relations problems
11 and an increased supply of trained personnel available for
12 foreign assignment.

13 Equally valuable, in our opinion, would be the tendency
14 of this proposal to add to the number of universities able
15 to offer comprehensive instruction of this character and a
16 recognition of the professional academic status of the trained
17 individual in acquiring it by the provision for specialized
18 degrees.

19 More generally, we would commend the economy of utilizing
20 existing non-Federal graduate and undergraduate facilities
21 for such a purpose.

22 Where this training can be encompassed within areas of
23 definable information and instruction, the proposal represents
24 an efficient utilization of the existing facilities of our
25 universities.

61

2 We would, however, propose that this subcommittee consider
3 amending the draft of Section 1211. This section
4 provides that the Foreign Service Institute, which is presently
5 under the authority of the Secretary of State, would be trans-
6 ferred to the Board of Trustees of the Foreign Service Corps
7 established by the bill.

8 There is much to be said in favor of relegating to non-
9 Federal educational institutions those functions of the
10 Foreign Service Institute which duplicate available collegiate
11 curricula.

12 This would include such institute functions as teaching
13 basic language courses, trade economics, consular and commercial
14 procedures and the like.

15 On the other hand, we are equally cognizant, in the light
16 of our own experience, of the fact that the Foreign Service
17 Institute, apart from any specific instructional activity,
18 constitutes a very important center in State Department terms
19 for gatherings in seminar and colloquium by Senior Foreign
20 Service Officers and the sharing of experiences under the
21 guidance of the institute.

22 Similarly, the institute provides the opportunity of
23 making such experiences directly available to those juniors
24 who will be charged with the execution of State Department
25 procedures -- as distinguished from administering the
statutory and regulatory special interests of the other

62

1 Federal departments.

2 In other words, we feel that any competent foreign service
3 representative of the United States must have, in addition to
4 the type of training provided by S. 939, a specialization in
5 the overseas work of his own branch of government, whose
6 interests, in the long run, he is being sent abroad to further.

7 If this view is correct, then each department appointing
8 overseas personnel will necessarily be required to supplement
9 the general training under this bill for their own people.

10 In the case of the State Department, we see this as being
11 the most essential function of the Foreign Service Institute
12 as it is now organized, and distinct from its function in basic
13 foreign relations training.

14 With that exception, however, we favor the legislation as
15 recognizing the technical character of the representation of
16 the United States abroad, as providing for the education of
17 personnel to realize this and as increasing public and academic
18 awareness of the scope of the commitment of the United States
19 and its industries in foreign areas.

20 Senator Pell. Thank you.

21 Have you any questions, Senator?

22 Senator Dominick. Mr. Zogby, what was your experience in
23 the Foreign Service?

24 Mr. Zogby. Sir, after a stint in military government in
25 Germany as officer and civilian, I served as consular attache

63 1 in Istanbul, 1952-1954; political officer in Beirut, 1955-1958;
2 economic officer in 1959 in Frankfurt; and 1965 to 1967, public
3 affairs officer in Ceylon.

4 Senator Dominick. So you have had a broad experience in
5 a variety of different countries.

6 Mr. Zogby. Yes.

7 Senator Pell. Where were you between 1960 and 1965?

8 Mr. Zogby. I was attached to the Department in the Near
9 East. I am fluent in Arabic.

10 Senator Dominick. That is an achievement.

11 Mr. Zogby. My parents are largely responsible.

12 Senator Dominick. The experience level that you had,
13 then, should be able to give you some background as to the
14 advisability of having this type of undergraduate and perhaps
15 graduate work prior to the time of entering into the Foreign
16 Service. You think this is a good background, I gather.

17 Mr. Zogby. I definitely do.

18 Senator Dominick. Your Foreign Service Research, Inc.,
19 of which you are Vice President, what kind of an organization
20 is it? What does it do?

21 Mr. Zogby. It is designed to do research primarily for
22 American firms doing business abroad. To a large degree, we
23 concentrate on those American firms going into underdeveloped
24 areas, those most apt to need our expertise.

25 We also conduct surveys, negotiations. After all, many

64 1 of us still have very current contacts in countries. We have
2 on our roster 36 ambassadors, retired. We can handle, among
3 the 200 on our list, almost any language required, and cover
4 virtually every country.

5 Senator Dominick. That is a very imaginative type thing
6 which I am sure is extremely useful to a lot of people. I
7 wanted to get that into the record because I think the
8 testimony you are giving is important.

9 I gather that you are saying that you rather think if
10 we struck Section 1211 concerning the Foreign Service
11 Institute we would have a better bill.

12 Mr. Zogby. No, sir, I want to distinguish there
13 between a function of the Foreign Service Institute for
14 advanced work and refinement and continuation of training --
15 well, not training but continuation of the exchange of
16 expertise of officers, as distinct from the basic training it
17 is doing now.

18 Senator Dominick, you said earlier 57 percent of the time
19 is devoted to language training. This is the sort of thing
20 I believe we should definitely best be done in other
21 institutions.

22 Senator Dominick. The only problem with that is that if
23 you are going to do it in other institutions, you are going
24 to have to spread the people who need this information, this
25 training, around throughout the whole country as opposed to

65 1 having one close at hand which they could utilize while they
2 are conducting their jobs here in Washington.

3 Mr. Zogby. Sir, I would foresee that an individual
4 would concentrate in one or more languages in his undergraduate
5 study and start from that point to specialize in that language,
6 and that he would come to the Foreign Service Corps with a
7 language specialty.

8 Senator Dominick. Do you see any problem in this question
9 of two years or four years in the undergrdaute level of
10 scholarship?

11 Mr. Zogby. No, sir, I do not.

12 Senator Dominick. You would just as soon have it the
13 whole way through?

14 Mr. Zogby. I would, yes, sir.

15 Senator Dominick. Thank you very much, Mr. Zogby. I
16 appreciate your being willing to come and give this helpful
17 testimony.

18 Senator Pell. Thank you, Mr. Zogby. I congratulate you,
19 too, on setting up the sort of organization you have to make
20 use of the skills of former foreign service officers who very
21 often have a hard time marketing these particular skills.

22 Mr. Zogby. Thank you, sir.

23

24

25

66 1 Senator Pell. Our final witness is Dr. Vincent Davis
2 of the Princeton Center for International Studies, Princeton,
3 New Jersey.

xxxx

4 STATEMENT OF DR. VINCENT DAVIS

5 PRINCETON CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

6 PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

7 Senator Pell. Is the Princeton Center the same as the
8 Woodrow Wilson School?

9 Mr. Davis. The Center of International Studies, sir, is
10 the research component of the Woodrow Wilson School.

11 Senator Pell. Thank you.

12 Senator Dominick. If I may say so, Mr. Chairman, Dr.
13 Davis has been very helpful in many of the details on this
14 bill, and worked with me very closely when he was working at
15 the University of Denver in connection with the International
16 Studies Group there.

17 He has had a wide expertise not only in international
18 fields but also in the Pentagon problems that we have had,
19 defense-wise and otherwise.

20 Mr. Davis. I thank you for the opportunity to be here
21 today, and I would like to stress at the outset that my remarks
22 represent only my own personal views and professional judgments.

23 One of the advantages of coming last is that I can
24 associate myself with some of the remarks that were made
25 earlier.

67 1 I am very much in agreement with the remarks on the whole
2 of my esteemed friends and colleagues, Dean Wilcox and
3 Professor Tanter; also the remarks of our two distinguished
4 former Ambassadors here today, Mr. Allen and Mr. Hart, and
5 Professor Knoll.

6 Mr. Chairman and other distinguished Senators:

7 I greatly appreciate the invitation from the Education
8 Subcommittee to appear here today.

9 I plan to speak strongly in behalf of S. 939, a bill to
10 authorize a "United States Foreign Service Corps." However,
11 I would like to stress at the outset that my testimony will
12 represent only my own personal views and professional judgments.

13 I do not speak for any institutions, organizations, or
14 other individuals. At the same time, of course, I obviously
15 hope that a great many institutions, organizations, and other
16 individuals will share these views and judgments.

17 My files indicate that the distinguished author of S. 939,
18 Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado, first offered me the
19 privilege of commenting on this proposal at a breakfast meeting
20 in Denver on Monday morning, March 13, 1967.

21 I liked the basic idea very much then, and I have become
22 an increasingly strong supporter during the intervening three
23 years as I observed Senator Dominick's efforts to polish and
24 perfect this proposal.

25 He carefully and diligently sought the opinions and

68 1 judgments of active and former officials from all relevant
2 compoents of the U. S. Government and from the most knowledge-
3 able and respected leaders of American academic life.

4 I therefore find it difficult to improve on Senator
5 Dominick's own analysis of the bill and the related comments of
6 others as inserted in the Congressional Record of June 26,
7 1968, and February 7, 1969.

8 In view of these considerations, perhaps the most useful
9 service that I could perform would be an attempt to summarize
10 the advantages of this proposal from the points of view of
11 various categories of people, institutions and agencies having
12 an obvious interest in the matter.

13 From the point of view of the American public as a whole,
14 it is clear that the United States has played and will continue
15 to play a critical role in world affairs.

16 Precisely what this role is or ought to be will always be
17 a matter for public discussion and debate at any given point
18 in time, but any nation commanding the resources of the
19 United States will always be a critical factor in world
20 affairs both for what it decides to do and for what it does
21 not do.

22 The American public therefore has the very strongest and
23 most serious kind of interest in assuring that its citizens
24 in general, but particularly its relevant governmental officials,
25 obtain the finest available education and training in the

69 1 changing nature of a highly complex world.

2 The bill under consideration here is designed to
3 allocate a small fraction of the nation's resources in this
4 effort.

5 From the point of view of the American Government, this
6 bill's provisions for several thousand undergraduate scholar-
7 ships will allow the government for the first time to
8 penetrate a critical age level in the nation's talent pool
9 and compete in the recruitment of the most promising young men
10 and women for civilian careers in public service concerning
11 foreign affairs.

12 Many of the nation's most able young people begin to
13 acquire a sense of direction and purpose and commitment toward
14 lifetime careers while they are still in high school or
15 preparatory school. At approximately age 18 they are there-
16 fore ready to make some important decisions, and they look
17 over the range of apparent opportunities.

18 The military services for many years have been able to
19 recruit at this critical age level by means of appointments
20 to the service academies at West Point, Annapolis and
21 Colorado Springs, and by means of scholarship assistance and
22 other benefits associated with the ROTC programs.

23 Many other professional and vocational fields such as
24 the sciences, engineering, business, law and medicine also
25 begin to compete for talent at the 18-to-20 years age level

70 1 through undergraduate scholarship programs leading to careers
2 in those fields.

3 But the young man or woman at this 18-to-20 years age
4 level who aspires to a civilian career in foreign service has
5 never heretofore been able to see any educational programs
6 which would lead in this direction, or any forms of scholarship
7 assistance indicating that the Nation attaches a high priority
8 to careers of this kind.

9 The government can begin to compete for these people only
10 only as they are approaching the completion of their under-
11 graduate degrees, and even then the primary inducement is
12 the simple power of persuasive words. But by then many of
13 the most talented and purposeful young people will have
14 felt compelled to elect careers in other directions.

15 In summary, then, the government competes and recruits
16 within a significantly depleted talent pool when it is unable
17 to offer strong inducements to public service careers in foreign
18 affairs at the earlier 18-to-20 years age level.

19 Moreover, the remaining uncommitted talent pool at the
20 22 years age level as young people are graduating from college
21 contains a much higher proportion of those from affluent
22 socio-economic strata in the society, meaning that the absence
23 of scholarship inducements at earlier age levels thus deprives
24 the government of many talented young people who were not born
25 into families with comfortable incomes.

71

1 Another major advantage to the government in this proposed
2 legislation is that it is certainly the least expensive and
3 most efficient way to provide Federal support for education
4 and training in this critical field.

5 It will require a very small administrative staff and very
6 low administrative overhead.

7 It will require no investment in physical facilities or
8 real estate.

9 It is, pure and simple, a scholarship and fellowship
10 program with almost all of the indicated appropriations
11 representing an investment in talented people. It is, there-
12 fore, a very substantial bargain for the taxpayers.

13 From the point of view of participating undergraduate
14 students, this proposed legislation offers many attractive
15 features.

16 As I have already indicated here, it will open up for
17 interested high school seniors a clear avenue toward civilian
18 careers in public service in foreign affairs, where no such
19 avenue appeared to exist before at that critical age level.

20 In exchange for an opportunity and a commitment to enter
21 careers of this kind, they will receive free high quality under-
22 graduate educations from a choice of the best colleges and
23 universities in the Nation.

24 They will be selected to participate in the program on the
25 basis of rigorous nationwide competitive examinations.

72 1 Scholars, teachers and educational administrators who are
2 professional specialists in foreign affairs will play a
3 significant role in the development of the competitive
4 examinations.

5 Therefore, in addition to the important financial
6 assistance which is involved, there will also be a distinct
7 personal honor in being selected to participate in the under-
8 graduate component of this program.

9 From the point of view of participating colleges and
10 universities, this proposed legislation has a great many
11 appealing dimensions.

12 First of all, the colleges and universities will have
13 a significant role in shaping and operating the program.

14 Four of the nine members of the Board of Trustees will
15 be professional educators.

16 The bill provides for academic consultants to help in
17 preparing the competitive examinations noted earlier in this
18 testimony, and for representatives from academic life to be
19 consulted in all other aspects of the program.

20 Unlike a number of other pieces of proposed and enacted
21 legislation whose provisions are more or less rammed down the
22 throats of participants on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, this
23 bill provides resources within very broad guidelines and then
24 puts a large part of the responsibility on the educational
25 and academic profession to fill in the details and to make it

73 1 work.

2 Second, the colleges and universities selected to
3 participate will be chosen because they already offer
4 distinguished programs and courses of study in fields relevant
5 to the needs of American officials in foreign affairs.

6 Therefore, these schools will not be required to do any-
7 thing substantially different from what they have been doing
8 and offering all along.

9 Third, the participating colleges and universities will
10 find that substantial amounts of their own scholarship and
11 fellowship funds will be released for allocation to other
12 deserving students, because many students previously attending
13 schools on support from funds generated by the colleges
14 and universities themselves would be eligible competitors for
15 participation in this program.

16 In that sense, there is an indirect form of institutional
17 support incorporated implicitly in this bill.

18 From the point of view of the participating government
19 agencies -- and this would include almost all agencies employing
20 civilian professionals in positions concerned with foreign
21 affairs -- perhaps the most attractive provision of this bill
22 is the stipulation for 1,500 graduate-level fellowships.

23 A concept that has gained wide acceptance in business,
24 professional and governmental fields in recent years is the
25 principle of mid-career education.

74 1 New knowledge is accumulating at such a rapid rate in all
2 fields that it is no longer possible for a man to gain all of
3 his formal education between the ages of perhaps six and 22
4 and then to assume that he will never again need any further
5 formal schooling.

6 On the contrary, periods of advanced formal education
7 are likely to be required at various stages throughout a
8 person's career.

9 This is recognized throughout government, and advanced
10 degrees are rapidly becoming a prerequisite for promotion to
11 higher rank levels in many agencies.

12 For example, the list released a few weeks ago which named
13 the 76 Air Force colonels recently selected for promotion to
14 brigadier general showed that more than half of these officers
15 hold advanced graduate degrees, with seven of them holding
16 the Ph.D.

17 The situation is much the same, if not indeed more rigorous,
18 with respect to Army promotions.

19 Over most of the 1950's, and until the 1960's, the latest
20 figures I saw said that the Army regularly sent over 400
21 regular Army officers per year to the graduate schools.

22 I am told that an advanced degree is very rapidly becoming
23 a prerequisite for promotion to higher rank in the Army.

24 Unfortunately, however, the civilian agencies with
25 professional personnel in foreign affairs have been far less

75 1 successful than the armed forces in implementing this concept
2 of mid-career education, in part because the civilian agencies
3 have lacked appropriate financial resources.

4 One result is that energetic and motivated civilian
5 officials who desire advanced education have been required in
6 many or most cases to pay for this out of their own pockets
7 and to achieve it in miscellaneous night school programs or
8 similar arrangements which often lack academic distinction.

9 Another result is that many if not most relevant civilian
10 agencies have simply fallen well behind the armed forces in
11 gaining significant numbers of professional personnel with
12 desired levels of advanced education.

13 The Dominick bill would be a major step in the right
14 direction toward correcting this circumstance. This, in turn,
15 would serve as a major career morale factor not only in
16 recruiting greater numbers of more talented people in public
17 service in foreign affairs in the first place, but also in
18 retaining more of those people for full careers.

19 At this point, I might interject a couple of other
20 comments. Some two years ago in some personal scholarly
21 research that I was undertaking, I addressed some questions
22 to the State Department very similar to some questions that
23 Senator Dominick raised this morning with Mr. Mace, attempting
24 to get some comparative data, between Foreign Service Officers
25 and people in other governmental agencies.

76 1 The data was not available. It was said to me that the
2 State Department was attempting to undertake some studies that
3 would provide the data.

4 I am not aware that the studies were ever completed or
5 the data ever became available. But I did come upon several
6 other documents from other sources that bear on this point.

7 The Educational Testing Service, a private organization
8 in Princeton, is responsible for the college board exams,
9 graduate record exams, and many other examinations of this
10 sort of ETS undertook in 1967 a study at the suggestion of
11 the State Department to compare Foreign Service Officers over
12 a period of time to see whether there were trends in performance
13 on the Foreign Service Officer examinations, and also a study
14 to compare Foreign Service Officer candidates with those
15 people who had taken the graduate record examination, that is,
16 people who were interested in going to graduate schools.

17 Several interesting conclusions emerged. The first is
18 that there were no trends over the period 1964-1965-1966 that
19 the study covered showing that the quality of people applying
20 for the Foreign Service was going either up or down.

21 It was a flat curve.

22 Secondly, the people taking the Foreign Service test at
23 best had only a very slight advantage or only very slightly
24 higher scores than all of the people across the country who
25 were attempting to get into graduate programs anywhere, of any

77

1 kind.

2 Then there was a third kind of comparison that the study
3 made which I found interesting. It took a look at the people
4 who had taken both exams, people who had taken the Foreign
5 Service exam and the graduate record exam.

6 This tended to support an observation that many of us
7 in academic life have made. Many people, when they get their
8 undergraduate degrees, would like to go to graduate school,
9 but they are not certain whether they will be admitted to
10 graduate school for studies in foreign affairs problems, so
11 they hedge by taking the foreign exam.

12 If they get admitted, they will take it, and if not,
13 they hope they will get into the Foreign Service and
14 ultimately come back and return to graduate school.

15 They are not, in that sense, really committed to a career
16 in the Foreign Service.

17 Senator Pell. I think there are those who do vice versa,
18 too.

19 Mr. Davis. There may be some who do vice versa, but I
20 have encountered many fewer who do vice versa, and my colleagues
21 in the profession, I think, at many other schools,
22 have encountered far fewer who do it the other way.

23 Two years ago in the State Department there was concern
24 whether the Foreign Service was losing its best young officers.
25 There was a study that was undertaken under the direction of the

78 1 Office of the Junior Officer Program, and one of the con-
2 clusions that was reached was the following with respect to
3 retention. I quote from an internal memorandum in the State
4 Department.

5 "It is interesting that the survey found 'that the
6 more or less typical resignee,' -- I think that is an
7 important point -- "was one who returns to academic life
8 either to teach or to obtain further graduate education.

9 "Our experience with young officers has led us to
10 conclude that most young people entering the service today
11 tend to magnify the similarities between academic work
12 and foreign service work and to minimize the differences.

13 "It is only after they have been in the foreign
14 service for some time that they discover for themselves
15 that their underlying academic bent was stronger than they
16 had realized."

17 My impression is that the academic bent was there all
18 along, confirming the other point that I just made, this, to
19 me, supports the proposal we are here considering.

20 If it looked to be possible for a young man to enter
21 the Foreign Service and to obtain more advanced education
22 a part of his career with the government, I think it would be
23 a much more attractive career.

24 But if he comes to the conclusion that the Foreign
25 Service is a form of professional life that discourages advanced

79 1 education and does not seem to be interested in that particular
2 form of personal improvement, he becomes discouraged and the
3 retention problem I think is heightened by this circumstance.

4 The U. S. Department of State is one agency which should
5 have, I think, a particularly strong interest in supporting
6 this bill.

7 Although tradition, precedent and law would suggest that
8 the State Department is charged with the overall management
9 and direction of American foreign affairs, it is also true
10 that the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, the Post
11 Office and the Treasury and most other major agencies of
12 government have developed substantially internal units which
13 are active in foreign affairs.

14 The State Department, however, has generally lacked
15 adequate mechanisms to encourage coordinated educational
16 programs for the foreign affairs personnel in these other
17 agencies.

18 While S. 939 certainly does not give the State Department
19 a dominating position on this matter, it does provide that
20 the Secretary of State will be the only Executive Branch
21 official sitting on the Board of Trustees for this program.

22 In this way, and through consultation on the part of the
23 Secretary of State with his counterparts in other concerned
24 departments and agencies, the Department of State should be
25 able to exercise more of the initiative and responsibility in

80 1 the education of all public servants in foreign affairs than
2 has previously been the case.

3 Clearly, it would seem that this responsibility ought to
4 reside in this manner within the Department of State, in an
5 influential but not dominating role.

6 In some parallel respects, the American Foreign Service
7 Association is an organization which should have a particularly
8 strong interest in supporting this bill.

9 For many years the AFSA was somewhat like a rather small
10 and exclusive fraternity consisting of the Foreign Service
11 Officers of the State Department.

12 Within the past two years, however, the AFSA has gained
13 vigorous new leadership and what appears to be an emerging
14 new image of itself.

15 According to this new image, the AFSA would no longer
16 be essentially an appendage of the State Department but would
17 become a true professional society potentially embracing
18 within its membership all civilian professionals concerned
19 primarily with foreign affairs duties in all agencies of
20 government.

21 The Dominick bill, if enacted, should provide a reservoir
22 of talented people sharing common educational experiences, a
23 common commitment to the idea of professionalism in American
24 foreign affairs, and therefore, a common interest in joining
25 within the new vision which seems to be emerging within the

81 1 American Foreign Service Association. This, in turn, should
2 improve the quality and the cohesion of American foreign
3 policy.

4 Another trend involving the American Foreign Service
5 Association is highly commendable and is worth of note here,
6 because the enactment of the Dominick bill should facilitate
7 this trend.

8 For many years, a common attitude in the Foreign Service
9 and in the Department of State more generally was a skepticism
10 toward the research on international and foreign policy issues
11 originating in academic life.

12 The diplomats tended to feel that the campus professors
13 studied abstract problems in abstract ways which had very
14 little relationship to the day-to-day policy problems confronted
15 by the public servant.

16 The professors, on the other hand, thought that the
17 diplomats attached no weight to any kind of learning except
18 whatever they learned in their own on-the-job experience in
19 public service.

20 The diplomats thought the professors couldn't see the
21 trees for the forest, and the professors thought the
22 diplomats couldn't see the forest for the trees. Each side
23 thought that the other group tended to write in a private
24 incomprehensible jargon well removed from the English
25 language.

82 1 In the past few years, however, a fresh and encouraging
2 new attitude has developed in both quarters. Both sides now
3 seem to feel that there is much to be gained by all parties if
4 a congenial new spirit of open communications and cooperation
5 wherever possible could replace the old arm's length reciprocal
6 skepticism, if not hostility.

7 One concrete example of the new movement is the Joint
8 Committee between the American Foreign Service Association,
9 consisting primarily of Foreign Service Officers, and the
10 International Studies Association, consisting primarily of
11 campus professors.

12 There are even some campus scholars who are joining AFSA
13 and some governmental officials joining ISA. The AFSA-ISA
14 Joint Committee has already initiated several highly promising
15 new programs, and more are under consideration.

16 This new effort to build bridges of effective
17 communication between scholars and diplomats should be
18 encouraged by the Dominick bill, because both the scholars
19 and the diplomats would be in some respects joined in the
20 shared task of making the Dominick program work.

21 In some other respects, the scholars and the diplomats
22 ought to continue to keep a wary eye on each other if the
23 separate purposes of each profession is to be best served.

24 But a wary eye does not require an adversary relationship
25 leading to the breakdown of all useful communications.

83

1 Now, in conclusion, I should perhaps devote a few
2 moments to some of the kinds of criticisms and reservations
3 which I have heard with respect to S. 939.

4 Some people have said that S. 939 looks too much like
5 ROTC programs at a time when ROTC programs are allegedly
6 unpopular among many college students.

7 The first answer to this objection is that S. 939 is
8 significantly, even radically, different from ROTC programs
9 in almost all respects except that participating undergraduates
10 under the provisions of S. 939 would receive free college
11 educations in exchange for a commitment for a certain period
12 of government service.

13 Secondly, evidence obtained in the recent study of ROTC
14 programs under the direction of President George C. S. Benson
15 of Claremont Men's College (on leave to conduct this study for
16 DOD) indicated that significant unhappiness with ROTC-type
17 programs in any case is largely confined to a handful of
18 schools primarily in the Eastern States.

19 Third, for all of those colleges and universities which
20 consider part of their responsibility to be the education of
21 young men and women for careers in public service -- and a
22 great many schools have longstanding traditions and programs
23 in this area -- it is hard to imagine a program more acutely
24 attuned to the principles and values shared by most professors
25 and many students than the program called for by S. 939.

84

1 The participating schools will have great freedom and
2 control in shaping the nature of the program as it is
3 implemented on each campus.

4 To repeat again, this is primarily a scholarship and
5 fellowship program with very few strings attached as far as
6 the colleges and universities are concerned.

7 Some have suggested that students participating under
8 the provisions of S. 939 would be subjected tountenable
9 pressures if the United States should ever again experience
10 the kind of situation existing in the early and mid-1950's
11 when the loyalty of many Americans, especially a number of
12 people in the State Department, was publicly questioned.

13 That tragic period, however, involved and jeopardized
14 the careers of many people in private as well as in public
15 life.

16 If that kind of diseased hysteria should ever again
17 strike this Nation -- and no man should drop his guard against
18 a repetition -- there is no evidence that people in public
19 service would be anymore vulunerable than those in private
20 life.

21 Some people seem to feel that the provisions of S. 939
22 would tend to discriminate against those who did not participate
23 in its undergraduate program but who later decided that they
24 would like to try for a career in public service in foreign
25 affairs.

85

1 There is nothing in S. 939 which disrupts, undermines
2 or eliminates the traditional existing routes of entry into
3 public service in the fields of foreign affairs.

4 This bill provides for supplemental existing to
5 existing routes and does not in any sense replace them.

6 Some people seem to feel that a handful of prominent
7 schools are eminently better qualified to produce well-educated
8 people for foreign affairs careers than all other schools, but
9 that the provisions for geographical distribution in S. 939
10 would tend to discriminate against the products of these few
11 schools.

12 Representatives of at least a few of these same schools,
13 curiously, have taken an almost reverse position with respect
14 to ROTC programs.

15 An implementation of this kind of argument could result
16 in loading the civilian Foreign Service with the graduates
17 of just a few schools while letting the armed forces find
18 their officers from other places.

19 In any case, basic democratic values and other sound
20 political arguments suggest the wisdom of recruiting public
21 servants from all parts of the Nation and from a diverse range
22 of educational institutions.

23 Many other Federal programs such as the White House
24 Fellows Program, and respected private endeavors such as the
25 Rhodes Scholarship Program, have long followed the principle

86 1 of geographic distribution.

2 Substantial financial support from Federal and State
3 Governments, from foundations and from other sources over the
4 past two decades have resulted in the establishment of many
5 excellent programs in international and foreign affairs at
6 colleges and universities across the United States.

7 Some of these objections, of course, are essentially
8 elitest arguments which represent special pleading on behalf
9 of institutions or groups previously thinking of themselves
10 as enjoying some sort of privileged role in dominating American
11 foreign affairs, or dominating the institutions which make
12 American foreign policy, or dominating the source of people
13 who enter these careers.

14 It is unfortunate and to be regretted that, in an age
15 and time when more and more Americans are insisting on their
16 right to participate in the politics and the life of a
17 democratic society, some space must be devoted to rebutting
18 objections which are basically undemocratic in their underlying
19 premises.

20 In conclusion, wise and prudent men will undoubtedly be
21 able to study S. 939, find potential or actual problems
22 associated with it as it now reads, and then devise ways to
23 eliminate the problems while improving the overall fulfillment
24 of its purposes.

25 As for myself, I find little in it to criticize and much in

87 1 it to praise.

2 In a crude and elemental sense, it is a question of
3 whether we prefer for American public officials in the field
4 of foreign affairs to be ignorant or educated.

5 Since no man would opt for ignorance, it is then a
6 question of how best to achieve the desired degrees and kinds
7 of education.

8 I believe that American colleges and universities have a
9 great capability and a great responsibility for helping in this
10 task, but this costs money.

11 For too long most professional and vocational fields in
12 the United States have relied on the colleges and universities
13 to provide the basic education required for entry into those
14 fields but without underwriting any significant part of the
15 costs of this final pre-entry education.

16 Enactment of Senator Dominick's bill would signify that
17 the Federal Government is now willing to accept a larger part
18 of its responsibility in paying for the educations of those
19 who desire to dedicate their careers to public service in
20 foreign affairs.

21 If the Government does accept this responsibility, I feel
22 sure that the Nation's colleges and universities then can and
23 will accept and more adequately fulfill their share of the
24 responsibility.

25 Thank you very much.

88 1 Senator Pell. Thank you. As I understand it, you are
2 here in a private capacity?

3 Mr. Davis. Correct. I am not representing any
4 organization or institution.

5 Senator Pell. Thank you.

6 Senator Dominick.

7 Senator Dominick. We have a letter, as you know, from
8 two of the Woodrow Wilson people, Mr. Chairman, which will be
9 put into the record. We have one from Dr. Coheen, who is
10 against the bill, president of the university; and one from
11 Mr. Black, Director of Research, who supports the bill and
12 supports it quite strongly.

13 Senator Pell. There is going to be a meeting of the
14 Council of the Woodrow Wilson school. Perhaps this could
15 be put on the agenda for that meeting and an expression might
16 be forthcoming. You might pass that on to Dean Lewis.

17 Mr. Davis. I will suggest to Dean Lewis this is an
18 idea worthy of his consideration.

19 Senator Dominick. Dr. Davis, I sincerely appreciate your
20 giving us this time, and I sincerely appreciate the help
21 which you provided all the way through, and a good deal of
22 the inspiration for my follow-through on the bill.

23 I am not sure that you particularly want to comment on
24 this, but I would like to get your ideas, if you have them
25 formulated, on the question of what we are going to do with

89 1 the Foreign Service Institute. I have a kind of feeling this
2 is becoming a flag that people will wave who are against the
3 bill.

4 I wonder if it might not be advisable to take it out of
5 the bill so we wouldn't have interjection of this issue in
6 the process of what is fundamentally a scholarship program.

7 Mr. Davis. I think one could argue that either way
8 in terms of the political tactics of advancing the cause of
9 the bill, but if one wanted to look at it purely as a matter
10 of principle I was impressed by Ambassador Hart's comments
11 earlier today, and I would have a minor disagreement with
12 Ambassador Allen's suggestion that FSI is in some respects
13 like the War Colleges.

14 If one follows Ambassador Allen's reasoning, it would
15 be a mistake to put FSI under the provisions of this bill. But
16 I am not sure that is the appropriate agency.

17 I think Ambassador Hart was essentially correct when
18 he suggested that the institute had become a different kind
19 of organization than perhaps originally envisaged.

20 It is now a national resource, an important one, and I
21 think it would be able to draw on a wider range of talents
22 from the academic communities and provide a wider range of
23 services to governmental agencies if it were detached in the
24 way you propose from its present close relationship with the
25 State Department and could exist within the context of this

90

1 particular program you propose.

2 On balance, I think I tend to propose leaving it in, but
3 I can understand that there would be some good arguments in
4 favor of removing this particular clause from the bill.

5 Senator Dominick. I gather from your testimony that
6 you are still in favor of the four-year undergraduate
7 scholarship program as opposed to a two-year program?

8 Mr. Davis. Yes, I very much am. One of the witnesses
9 commenting earlier today suggested the flexibility. I would
10 buy that as an important modification. It ought to be
11 possible for people to enter the undergraduate program either
12 directly out of high school or provision alternatively for
13 them to apply and enter the program for the last two years
14 only.

15 It seems to me this is a good case where one could have
16 his cake and eat it, too, and there is much to be said for
17 this sort of flexibility.

18 Senator Dominick. The State Department commented this
19 morning, Mr. Mace in particular, that there were two things
20 which were largely predominant in his opposition to the bill,
21 or the State Department's opposition.

22 One, of course, was this Foreign Service Institute.

23 The other was the fact that there was no need for the
24 bill. This was based on the fact that they are taking 150 to
25 175 people a year from the applicants and they had some 5,000

91

1 applicants.

2 Therefore, they could pick and choose among that group.
3 What kind of an answer do we have to that?

4 Mr. Davis. That strikes me as an inadequate,
5 quantitative argument. I am more concerned about the
6 qualitative considerations.

7 As I already noted, based on this ETS study, the Foreign
8 Service average score is only a tiny bit better than the
9 average score of people across the country desiring to go
10 to graduate schools.

11 I think that the foreign affairs personnel of the U. S.
12 Government ought to be substantially above average and not
13 just a little bit above average.

14 I have already suggested in my testimony that the people
15 who take this examination, whatever the ratio may be between
16 5,000 who take it and 150 or so who are accepted, wholly
17 aside from that, it seems to me that the people who take it
18 are coming from a depleted talent pool, because that is
19 the talent pool that is not formed until age 22. People have
20 already made many important commitments, many talented people
21 have made important commitments to other vocational and
22 vocational fields by that time.

23 So whatever the size of that pool, it is depleted in
24 terms of the qualitative talent in it. I would make one other
25 comment.

92

1 I think the State Department may be excessively sanguine
2 if it assumes that the numbers and qualifications of people
3 who apply for the Foreign Service in the 1970's will look
4 even as good as they looked in the 1950's and 1960's for the
5 following reason: Federal support and private foundation
6 support for international affairs programs have been
7 drastically cut within the last few years.

8 This is already meaning a very significant retrenchment
9 in international and foreign affairs programs on many campuses.

10 I think many of us will be astonished next fall when we
11 look at the cut in admitted numbers of students in graduate
12 programs, in particular, across the country.

13 I know many schools are cutting by as much as 50 percent
14 and even more, down to a third of what they took last year,
15 because they don't have the fellowship and scholarship money
16 to give.

17 They are having to cut back from figures approximating
18 30 at some schools down to 10 who will be entering graduate
19 programs in these fields. That means in the absence of
20 new fellowship and scholarship support that there will be a
21 quantitative reduction in the total number of people who will
22 be available, so the State Department will be competing within a
23 much smaller talent pool.

24 Other competitors for that talent will be in there, too,
25 and it is an open question as to whether the State Department

93

1 can hang on to its competitive position that it has had
2 in the past to get whatever it has been able to get heretofore.

3 But I suspect it is going to be quite rough.

4 Senator Dominick. Dr. Davis, just for the record, I
5 wonder if you would give us your background, your general
6 education background, and some of the things you have been
7 doing.

8 Mr. Davis. I have been a member of the faculty at
9 Princeton University, at Dartmouth College, and for the past
10 seven years at the graduate schools of International Studies
11 at Denver.

12 I have been for the past six years the Executive Director
13 of the International Studies Association which I think it is
14 now accurate to say is perhaps the most prominent professional
15 society in American academic life in the overall fields of
16 international studies. Indeed, the organization has a sub-
17 stantial number of members in a number of other countries
18 around the world.

19 My personal field of specialization in my scholarly
20 research is American foreign policy and American military
21 policy.

22 In terms of my work for professional societies, in terms
23 of my work on campus, and in terms of my personal research,
24 I have been closely associated with a number of people in the
25 government, in the State Department and in the Defense

94

1 Department, and other agencies with roles in foreign affairs.

2 My research keeps me in close contact with those people
3 and so does my work for the International Studies Association.

4 Senator Dominick. Thank you very, very much. I think
5 this has been most helpful.

6 Senator Pell. Would you submit for the record, or have
7 you with you, the studies pointing up your point that the
8 State Department's new FSOs are only a trifle above the
9 average coming into the graduate schools around the country?

10 Mr. Davis. I will be happy to provide that for the
11 committee's record.

12 (The information to be furnished follows:)

13 COMMITTEE INSERT

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

95

1 Senator Pell. The record will be left open for two
2 weeks, at least two weeks.

3 I would like, incidentally, to further compliment the
4 principal sponsor of the legislation, who believes in this
5 bill so strongly. Actually, he and I both are on the
6 Georgetown Center for Strategic Studies and have a long-
7 standing interest in this general field.

8 I have a couple of thoughts as we wind up today's
9 hearings.

10 One is I am wondering what sanction there is to cause
11 people to stay in the government service. I don't think they
12 can sign a contract or anything of that sort. I think it would
13 be very difficult to implement that program. What is your
14 thought?

15 Senator Dominick. We have one now, of course, with
16 respect to the military, for anybody who goes through the
17 academy. The theory is that if you successfully complete it
18 and you undertake this examination in view of the support
19 you have received from the government, that you would agree
20 to serve five years.

21 To be perfectly truthful with you, if they decided in
22 the third year that they don't want it, I don't think there
23 is any personal service contract that you can hold a person
24 to. I think this was outlawed back in the days of
25 Shakespeare, as I remember. It is a kind of moral

96

1 commitment.

2 Senator Pell. Another thought was if the name was changed
3 from Foreign Service Corps to Foreign Service Scholarship
4 Program, this may sound like semantics but it would perhaps
5 have a lessened effect on the clique concept.

6 I was wondering whether that idea had been discussed
7 before.

8 Senator Dominick. It has been. I have been perfectly
9 flexible on this. We put the word "Corps" in to begin with
10 because of the Teacher Corps, the Poverty Corps, the Peace
11 Corps, the whole works that we have had around.

12 I am perfectly willing to change the name.

13 Senator Pell. Another point is in connection with the
14 appointing process.

15 I am a little bothered by that because I am one of the
16 rather small minority, I guess, and I am not sure whether I
17 still am or not, who really are not happy with the way we
18 appoint our people to the academies now.

19 We are not at all convinced that it should be within our
20 prerogatives to do it.

21 I have some hesitancy about seeing members of the Congress
22 with increased appointing powers rather than decreased. It
23 looks as if we finally got out of appointing Postmasters, and
24 I hope we get out of appointing cadets at some point.

25 I think we should be going in the other direction.

97 1 Senator Dominick. On the cadets, I would disagree with
2 you. That is one of the best things we do when we really
3 work at it. I thoroughly enjoy it.

4 On this we have a little bit different situation. What
5 we do is simply nominate people to take the exams. We don't
6 appoint them into this particular situation. They have to do
7 it on an examination basis from there on in.

8 Senator Pell. That is like the Merchant Marine Academy.

9 Senator Dominick. That is correct, which is no problem
10 at all.

11 I would think we have a different situation here than
12 we do with the academy.

13 Senator Pell. I thank you very much.

14 The record will stay open for at least two weeks.

15 At this point, the hearings will adjourn.

xxxx 16 (Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m. the subcommittee concluded.)

17

18

19

20

pg/Reys 21

1-29-70

Senate Labor 22

S...

23

24

25